INDIANA UNIVERSITY
STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
School of Education
W. W. Wright Education Building, Suite 4228
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

(812) 856-8362/8364

1996-97 JOURNAL STAFF

IUSPA Officers 1995-96		IUSPA Officers 1996-97	
President	Carol McBryde	President	John Jobson
Vice President	Allison Smith	Vice President	Darin Junck
Secretary	Jennifer Forbes	Secretary	Stacey Price
Treasurer	Alan Rose	Treasurer	Clay Patty
Dir./Development	Suzanne Mendoza	Dir./Development	DeEttra Kudera
Dir./Outreach	Jane Eig	Dir./Outreach	Eunice Cabacungan Amy Oldfield
Dir./Prof. Dev.	Katrina Ross	Dir./Prof. Dev.	Jennifer Forbes
Dir./Programming	Ann Goropoulos Catherine Murray	Dir./Programming	Shannon Brown Kristen Heine
Dir./Relations	Chandra Baskin	Dir./Relations	Patty Alvarez

The *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association* is published annually by the Indiana University Student Personnel Association with support from the Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) Program. The *Journal* is produced expressly to provide an opportunity for HESA master's students to publish articles pertinent to the field of student affairs. The primary sources of funding for this year's *Journal* are alumni donations, the Department of Residence Life, and a grant from the Commitment to Assist Student Initiatives of the Indiana University Student Association. The important role that each of these contributors has played in the production of this edition is gratefully acknowledged and appreciated.

Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

Spring 1997 Edition

Contents

Editors' Comments

Suzanne J. Mendoza
Alan Rose

Welcome to the Spring 1997 edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*! It is with great pride that we present you with this latest edition of the HESA program's contribution to the higher education and student affairs literature. This edition's unique combination of articles is reflective of an interest by professionals and students alike in addressing realistic issues on our campuses in practical ways. Each article highlights or offers perspective on areas of concern to student affairs practitioners. The presentation here of knowledge insightful and helpful in our practice as student affairs professionals is the product of a wide range of student interests and inspirations to be considered carefully in the pages ahead.

Our first article, "Personal Reflections on Campus-Based Professional Community in Student Affairs" acknowledges a need for and reflects on the necessity of a professional community among student affairs practitioners based on key characteristics. "Supplemental Instruction Programs: An Effective Way to Increase Student Academic Success?" is an exploration of the impact of these special study programs on the academic success of students. "Perceptions of Prospective Masters Students" is an environmental study on the effects of the perceptions of Indiana University- Bloomington and its Higher Education and Student Affairs graduate program on students' choice to attend the institution. "Minority Admissions Policies and the Courts: What's a School to Do?" takes on the challenge of reconciling institutional commitment to diversity with the legal issues tangled in admissions policies. "Free Speech and Campus Hate Speech Codes" takes a thorough look at the issues of free speech and campus hate speech codes manifesting themselves on our campuses today. "GROUPS 1996: Goals, Values, Perceptions in Intentional Residence Life Interventions" is an environmental assessment of the intentional interventions by the residence life program during a summer bridge program at Indiana University which results in recommendations for the identification, implementation, and evaluation of a program's goals for student affairs practitioners. "The Role of Faculty in the Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics" discusses the role of faculty in intercollegiate

athletics to offer insight into the importance of faculty in maintaining an academic focus for intercollegiate athletics. "AIDS/HIV and Higher Education" addresses the necessity for and the potentially positive impact of educational programming on HIV/AIDS on college campuses.

The presentation of these articles as a collective contribution to the body of higher education and student affairs literature is only possible because of the dedicated efforts and support of the *Journal* Review Board; Bruce Jacobs, our faculty advisor; and Joyce Regester in the HESA department. We would also like to thank the Indiana University Student Association (IUSA), the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (IUSPA), the Department of Residence Life, adjunct faculty members Bob Weith and Pam Freeman, and our generous alumni for their critical financial support of our publication.

Finally, this year's efforts in producing the *Journal* are a success thanks to the involvement of our other co-editors in training, HESA program first year students, Jennifer Forbes and Ryan Forsythe. We thank you and wish you the same support and dedication with which you have provided us.

Please enjoy this year's edition of the *Journal* - there is exciting information and ideas we can all learn from in the pages ahead!

Suzanne J. Mendoza graduated from the HESA program in 1997. In 1995, she received a B. A. degree in English from Santa Clara University. While at IU, she served as an Assistant Coordintor in Forest Residence Center and she completed a practicum with the Indiana University Foundation.

Alan Rose graduated from the CSPA program in 1997. He majored in English at Haverford College, graduating in 1990. Prior to attending IU, he worked in retail management as well as computer and accounting consulting. He also pursued a career as a singer-songwriter-acoustic guitarist and released a self-produced album of original material. At IU, he has worked as a Graduate Resident Assistant in the Collins Living Learning Center and as an Assistant Coordinator in Briscoe Residence Center.

State of the Program

Dr. Bruce Jacobs

Much like public television, the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association* needs funding to exist. Just like WTIU (the local station), the *Journal* is now being underwritten by local benefactors. Bob Weith and Pam Sprong have assigned their teaching stipends from the Residence Life Seminar (U559) to reduce the cost of the *Journal*. Their generous support, along with that of other alumni contributors, has made this year's publication possible.

The faculty in the HESA program has developed a recruitment program designed to increase the numbers of students of color admitted to the program. A specific effort was made through the Minority Staff Support Network at the Oshkosh Placement Exchange (OPE). Both academic and assistantship interviews were conducted for the program at OPE. Deborah Carter chaired a committee within the School of Education that has also addressed this issue. It is our goal to recruit students to the program that reflect the demographic makeup of the student population on campus today and in the future.

Michael Parsons and I have spent the last year as coordinators of the doctoral and master's programs respectively. Our efforts have been focused on improving the link between the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, creating new assistantships, and recruiting new students to the programs. Interest in the programs remains extremely high. There have been 430 inquiries for the master's program and 175 for the doctoral program. From those figures 115 were admitted to the master's program and 33 to the doctoral program. The Fall 1997 classes are not finalized at this time but we expect an incoming master's class of 35 and an incoming doctoral class of 15. These figures include both campuses.

The overall recruitment efforts were enhanced by the work of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association. A series of changes in the recruitment process enabled us to have more personal contact with each prospective student. The proposal from the students was championed by Dr. Guadalupe Anaya when it was presented at the faculty meeting. The students are currently conducting a survey of all prospective students to

determine how to best structure next year's recruitment effort. The role of our alumni remains important in this process and we appreciate your on-going commitment.

George Kuh has been on sabbatical this past year. He will return in the summer in a dual role. In addition to his position as Professor of Education, he will also serve as Associate Dean of the Faculty for Indiana University. In this role he will be working with IU's retention effort. Frankly, it is quite pleasing to hear terms like seamless learning, student learning imperative, and student culture being discussed in a variety of meetings around campus. George's new dual role can only bode well for the students in the program and the students of Indiana University. Don Hossler is finishing up his first year as Executive Associate Dean for the School of Education. While his role in the program has been reduced, he remains an active participant with individual students, at faculty meetings and with his research. The same is true of Fran Stage who was recently promoted to full professor.

Last year the students in the master's program developed and implemented a hooding ceremony for students graduating from the program at the Bloomington campus. The ceremony takes place the night before the University commencement exercises. Held in the School of Education, the ceremony is conducted by the faculty who place the master's hood over the head of each graduate. This year's class will continue the practice. From such efforts traditions are born.

Please consider coming back to campus at some point to reconnect with the "glory of ole' IU." Also, please consider the HESA program as you make your contribution to the annual fund drive. It is through your personal support that we are able to fund the *Journal* and support individual student's special projects.

Awards and Honors

Congratulations to these members of the Indiana University family on the following recognitions:

Jamie Washington, M.S. 1984	1997 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni Award
Donald Mikesell, Ed.D. 1970	1997 Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award
Carol McBryde, M.S. 1997	1997 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
Michael J. James	1996 Raleigh W. Holmstedt Fellowship Award
Robert J. Robeson	1996 Raleigh W. Holmstedt Fellowship Award
Patricia Muller	1997 August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
Jean-Noel Thompson	1997 Robert H. Wade II Fellowship Award
Bruce Jacobs	1997 Kate Hevner Mueller Award
Elizabeth Kirpius	1997 Kate Hevner Mueller Award
Lynn Luckhow	1997 School of Education Distinguished Alumni Award
Paula Rooney	1997 School of Education Distinguished Alumni Award
Patricia Volp	1996 Outstanding Student Personnel Professional - State of Missouri

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Nominations of individuals for the 1998 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf and Robert H. Shaffer Awards are now being accepted.

The Greenleaf Award is presented annually to the graduate of the master's degree program in Higher Education and Student Affairs "exemplifying the sincere commitment, professional leadership and personal warmth characteristic of the distinguished professor for whom the award is named." Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include Vickie Mech-Fields, Keith

Miser, Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, Frank Ardaiolo, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, William Bryan, Terry Williams, Marilyn McEwen, Gregory Blimling, Lawrence Miltenberger, and Jamie Washington.

The Robert H. Shaffer Award is presented to the graduate of the Indiana University Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Previous Shaffer Award recipients include John Welty, David Ambler, L. "Sandy" McLean, Thomas Hennessy, Jimmy Lewis Ross, Robert Ackerman, Don G. Creamer, Nell Bailey, Alice Manicur, Rodger Summers, Caryl Smith, and Donald Mikesell.

Nominations for both awards will close February 2, 1998. The awards will be presented at the 1998 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g., Vita) to Bruce Jacobs, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 4228, 201 N. Rose Avenue, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you!

Personal Reflections on Campus-Based Professional Community in Student Affairs

Terry E. Williams
Guest Author

In this essay, the author reflects on elements needed to establish professional community among student affairs practitioners in higher education. Shared values, focus on student learning, collaboration, deprivatized practice and reflective dialogue are key characteristics of professional communities that promote student learning.

Many student affairs practitioners would likely agree that it is becoming increasingly difficult today to remain current with the vast knowledge explosion that is occurring not only within our field but in higher education more broadly. There is much in our field to keep up with: new books, monographs, journal articles, videos, conferences and workshops, and internet-based sites that inundate us with many valuable new ideas, research, theories, and models to guide our practice. I know many practitioners in our field, myself included, who confess how challenging and, at times, frustrating it can be to find (or take) the time from our hectic schedules to stay current even as we acknowledge to our colleagues how important it is that we find the time for our own professional development. While keeping current with the literature in our own field is extremely important, I have, nonetheless, found that reading in areas not directly related to student affairs or even to higher education can also be a valuable use of our limited time as the following will hopefully illustrate.

A few weeks ago I found time to read the lead article in the Winter 1996 issue of the *American Educational Research Journal* which reported on a national study examining the relationship of student learning and school-based professional community among K-12 teachers. The research was thought-provoking and both relevant and helpful as I reflected on the work of student affairs professionals in higher education. For me, this particular study reinforced the value and critical importance of working to create on each of our own campuses a cohesive professional community among our student affairs colleagues if we are to be effective in enhancing

student-centered learning. While the research conducted was very sophisticated and well designed, I was struck by the simplicity of the factors the researchers identified that characterized the professional community found among the schools studied and, surprisingly, how familiar each factor was to me after having been in the student affairs profession for almost 25 years.

In the national study, Louis, Marks, and Kruse (1996) investigated factors that contribute to the development of professional community among elementary and secondary teachers in their own individual school settings and the extent to which the school-based professional community contributes to teachers *collectively* assuming both responsibility for student learning and to the enhancement of student learning itself. A basic assumption underlying this research was that how teachers interact with each other outside their own specialized work areas (i.e., their individual classrooms) is critical to their attempts to reform educational programs and to enhance student learning. The authors acknowledge that teachers have long pursued their own individual professional development and that "teacher professionalism must increase if education is to improve" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 758). However, while this argument is one that most educators would certainly support, the researchers state that in addition to individual professional development "attention also needs to be paid to the development of professional community: teachers' **collective** engagement in sustained efforts to improve practice" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 758).

Professional community, within the context of the above study, was described as a critical form of "social capital" needed by educational institutions in order to sustain and enhance the learning environment for students and was defined as "movement toward five elements of practice: shared values, focus on student learning, collaboration, deprivatized practice, and reflective dialogue" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 760). While these elements are not hierarchical, the researchers found that school-based professional community requires the presence of each element in order to have a positive impact on student learning environments (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996).

As I reviewed and considered the implications of the above research and its findings, questions arose within me about the current state of professional community among student affairs staff at my own institution and, more broadly, on college and university campuses across the country. I began to wonder whether the factors found by the researchers that contribute to professional community among teachers *and* facilitate the enhancement of student learning could be instructive for our work in student affairs? I thought about the response we would receive if we asked staff whether or not they considered themselves to be part of a "professional community" on their own campuses? For example, when considering the elements of professional community described above, would many staff report that, across student affairs departments on their campus (or, even *within* their own departments), there exists a shared set of values, principles, purpose, and/or mission that guide the work of their entire division on a day-to-day basis? Would they report that a sustained *collective* focus on student learning exists among all staff; and, that opportunities to collaborate across departments and to engage in reflective dialogue with one another about their work regularly occur in the workplace? I certainly would hope that some staff would respond in the affirmative to these questions; but, many, I suspect, would also report that they don't really feel part of a professional community on their own campuses although as individuals many would identify with the larger student affairs profession extending beyond the boundaries of their own campuses. Perhaps many would also identify with communities of professionals related to specialized functions and roles served within the field (i.e., admissions, financial aid, career development, residence life, etc.).

While many of us link our professional identity in various ways with the broader student affairs field (or, with particular national organizations like ACPA, NASPA, ACUHO-I, NACA, etc.), I raise these questions simply because I find myself increasingly questioning, given personal experience and the current climate that exists in many of our colleges and universities, the extent to which professional communities that truly foster student learning currently exist on our campuses within our student affairs divisions.

In conversations with student affairs staff in different departments at many institutions the same familiar stories are conveyed over and over about how low staff morale is in the division, about how little inter-departmental collaboration occurs with programming, about how fragmented communication across departments can be, and about how increasing competition among departments for reduced dollars and other institutional resources has pitted one group against another resulting in unhealthy and dysfunctional outcomes for individuals and for their organizations. More importantly, perhaps, I hear how little meaningful dialogue occurs among staff about their educator role on the campus and about how they can and must work together to facilitate true student learning. Blimling's (1996) recent essay provides an excellent overview of many external and internal pressures on student affairs organizations which, I believe, have unfortunately led many staff to "bury" themselves in their work in their own departments—a bunker mentality that often results in even less communication, collaboration and a shared sense of mission and purpose across departments. These and other forces have contributed and continue to contribute to the erosion of professional community among student affairs staff on our campuses or, at least, present formidable barriers to its creation in the first place.

My intent in raising what, I believe, are important questions about the state of professional community is that I am convinced that as student affairs professionals we have the talent, the knowledge, the skills, and the incentives needed to work together to create among our own staffs a cohesive community of professional educators who collectively have the potential of realizing both our institutions' and our own professional goals related to student learning and personal development. If we are serious about advancing an agenda that places student-centered learning at the core of our collective work on our campuses, then I suggest that careful reflection and discussion among staff about the elements that might contribute to professional community like those found in the Louis, Marks and Kruse (1996) study would serve us and our students well. The sections that follow provide a brief description of these factors with implications for our work on our campuses. These sections are not meant to be prescriptive but, instead, are intended to stimulate dialogue, discussion and perhaps even debate, among student affairs professionals as they consider what is

needed to establish a professional community of educators within their own student affairs divisions on their own campuses.

Shared values

The first element the researchers found in professional communities can serve as a foundation upon which professional community can be constructed in our student affairs divisions. This element is described as staff moving toward a sharing of a common set of values, beliefs, norms, and expectations which guide the core educational tasks that they perform each and every day for and on behalf of their students and their institutions. According to the researchers, members of a professional community thus "affirm, through language and action, common beliefs and values underlying assumptions about children, learning, teaching and teachers' roles; the nature of human needs, human activity, and human relationships; and the organization's extended societal role and its relationship with the surrounding environment" (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996, p. 760).

In student affairs, we are fortunate to have a rich history of written statements from individuals and from our national associations to guide us in reflecting on our mission, purpose, and goals in higher education and, additionally, in discussing the values, assumptions, and beliefs that motivate our work as educators. For example, early in the development of our profession and continuing through the 1960s we relied on the 1937 and 1949 statements of the Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Education, 1937, 1949) which set out basic values and a statement of purpose for our work. More recent documents include, in part, the Student Learning Imperative (American College Personnel Association, 1994), the draft statement entitled Defining Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1997), the Reasonable Expectations statement (Kuh, Lyons, Miller, & Trow, 1994), and the 1987 NASPA Perspective on Student Affairs. Each of these statements should serve as the basis for collective staff discussion about what we believe and value about the role and purpose of higher education in our society; what values and assumptions we hold about the students with whom we work; and finally, what our basic assumptions, values, and beliefs are about how students may learn in the college and university environment including what our role is in facilitating that learning (Stamatakos & Rogers, 1984).

I believe our profession already has a solid foundation of values, beliefs, principles, and assumptions that can and do guide our work and that systematic reflection on these values among all student affairs staffs will facilitate the establishment of the first element needed to form a genuine professional community among student affairs professionals on our campuses.

Collective focus on student learning

The researchers in the 1996 school-based study reported that "an undeviating concentration on student learning is a core characteristic of professional community" (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996, p. 760). On our campuses, this concentration requires that student affairs staff actively and systematically evaluate the ways in which their programs and activities promote student learning, "as distinguished from simply focusing on activities or strategies that may engage student attention" (p. 760). The Student Learning Imperative (SLI) (American College Personnel Association, 1994) and the draft Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1997) are excellent resources for assisting us to recenter our work around important learning goals and objectives that are consonant with our institutions' missions. The SLI, for example, posits that "if learning is the primary measure of institutional productivity by which the quality of undergraduate education is determined, what and how much students learn also must be the criteria by which the value of student affairs is judged" (p.2). To evaluate what we do on a daily basis in student affairs with learning outcomes criteria is a tremendous challenge for us but one that we are certainly capable of meeting. It is evident to us as well as others on our campuses that our programs do result in significant learning for students. In order to create a professional community on our campuses among student affairs staff, this critical element of maintaining a concerted *collective* focus on student learning must be addressed.

Collaboration

The third element reported to contribute to professional community involves the extent to which teachers within their own school setting genuinely collaborate with each other on educational activities. A collaborative spirit among staff leads to the sharing of expertise across

programs and departments. "Collaborative work also increases teachers' sense of affiliation with each other and with the school and their sense of mutual support and responsibility for effective instruction" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 760). This concept of collaboration is one with which many student affairs professionals are familiar. It seems that our literature and conference programs are filled with recommendations for increased collaboration among staff and faculty, among students and staff, and among staff, faculty and students. We have long recognized how important it is to open channels of communication and collaboration between ourselves and faculty; and numerous authors have called for greater collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs. Both the Student Learning Imperative and the draft Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs reaffirm the need for greater collaboration. For example, the Principles state that "collaborative decision-making and strong work relationships demonstrate a healthy institutional approach to learning by fostering inclusiveness, using multiple perspectives, and affirming shared educational values... Partnerships designed to advance student learning, meet student needs, and further the achievement of similar institutional goals, offer good opportunities for collaboration" (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1997, p. 38). With the increasing focus on collaboration among student affairs programs and academic affairs units and with students, we must not lose sight of the need to continue to find meaningful ways to collaborate **within** our student affairs units as well. While forging educational partnerships with other constituencies on and off campus is important in creating student-centered learning environments, we must also remember that creating educational partnerships with each other within our student affairs organizations is also very important to creating professional communities on our individual campuses.

Deprivatized practice and reflective dialogue

The final two elements that contribute to professional community are combined here because both elements share much in common. Deprivatized practice involves practitioners moving comfortably out of their own classrooms, offices, or departments and into the classrooms, offices, or departments of their colleagues in order "to share and trade off on the roles of mentor, advisor, or specialist" (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996, p. 760). The researchers found that "peer coaching relationships,

teamed teaching structures, and structured classroom observations are methods used to improve both classroom practice and collegial relationships. In this way, teachers also come to know each other's strengths and can therefore more easily obtain 'expert advice' from colleagues" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 760-761). Being a reflective practitioner implies a certain level of self-awareness about one's work and "by engaging in in-depth conversations about teaching and learning, teachers can examine the assumptions basic to quality practice" (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996, p. 761).

These elements require that student affairs staff take action to tear down the walls of their departmental "functional silos" (American College Personnel Association, 1994) where such barriers exist and, thus, to "deprivatize" their own work and that of their departments on the campus. With deprivatization, staff need to construct bridges between programs and departments where the specialized expertise, experience and talents of every staff member can be openly shared and discussed. Collectively, student affairs staff have much to offer one another by working to take full advantage of each others' strengths, acquired knowledge and unique experiences. In this way they can truly learn from one another. For example, the Student Learning Imperative and the draft Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs both emphasize the need for student affairs staff to use various methods of research, assessment and evaluation that will inform the work they do on the campus in fostering student learning. Not every staff member, understandably, has all the expertise needed to conduct research and/or to evaluate and assess all programs; however, by working together and by actively sharing expertise across departments, staff will be **collectively** engaged in sustained efforts to improve their practice which is a key outcome of professional communities (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996).

Conclusion

The five elements described above — shared values and norms, collective focus on student learning, collaboration, deprivatized practice, and reflective dialogue — all are important for the development of professional community among student affairs staffs on our individual campuses. Previous research conducted with school teachers has shown a positive relationship between the development of professional community

and student learning. Other factors that also support movement toward a professional community among educators include supportive institutional leadership, institutional openness to innovation, respect both within the division by staff members as well as external respect for the work of the staff, regular feedback on one's work, and support for continuous professional development for individual staff (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996, p. 763). Recent developments within the profession related to a renewed focus on student learning, on good practice in student affairs, and on the educator role for student affairs professionals are very encouraging in that the values and assumptions that ground these developments are the very ones needed to establish professional community among student affairs staffs on our campuses.

References

American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view: A report on a conference on the philosophy and development of student personnel work in colleges and universities.* (American Council on Education Studies, Series I, Vol. I, No. 3). Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Council on Education. (1949). *The student personnel point of view.* (American Council on Education Studies, Series VI, Vol. XIV, No. 13). Washington, D.C.: Author.

American College Personnel Association. (1994). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Admin istrators. (1997). Draft: Defining principles of good practice for student affairs. *Decennial convention program book,* 35-39. Washington, D.C.: Authors.

Blimling, G. S. (1996). The future of student affairs in a post-modern era. *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association,* 1-23.

Kuh, G., Lyons, J., Miller, T., & Trow, J. A. (1994). *Reasonable expectations: Renewing the educational compact between institutions and students.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 33,* 757-798.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (1987). *A perspective on student affairs.* Washington, D.C.: Author.

Stamatakos, L. C., & Rogers, R. R. (1984). Student affairs: A profession in need of a philosophy. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 400-411.

Terry E. Williams received his B.S. Ed. degree in Business Administration (1970) from Illinois State University and his M.S. degree in college student personnel administration (1974) from Indiana University. He holds a Ph.D. degree in Higher Education (1979) from the Florida State University. In 1980, he received the NASPA Dissertation of the Year Award. Dr. Williams is currently serving as Associate Professor of Higher Education and Interim Dean, School of Education, Loyola University Chicago. In 1992-93, Dr. Williams served as President of the American College Personnel Association and in 1994 he received the Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumnus/a Award from Indiana University.

Supplemental instruction programs: an effective way to increase student academic success?

Jane Eig

This paper explores the effect of supplemental instruction programs on student academic success. Combining study skills and techniques in peer-led interactive study sessions, supplemental instruction programs aim to equip students with more advanced learning tools. Advantages and disadvantages of supplemental instruction programs are presented. The paper concludes with an outline of some factors which should be considered prior to implementing supplemental instruction programs.

At the Indiana University-Bloomington (IUB) campus, between 8 and 10% of students fail to meet the academic requirement of maintaining a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 each semester (Moir and Beverstock, 1994). In response to the poor performance of students, IUB and other institutions have implemented supplemental instruction (SI) programs. The program identifies academic courses in which large numbers of students consistently receive low letter grades or withdraw from class. The intention of the SI program is to change the way students learn in order to increase their success.

The first SI programs were developed at the University of Missouri at Kansas City in 1973 by Dr. Deanna Martin (Widmar, 1994). An ancient Chinese proverb states "Tell me and I forget, show me and I remember, involve me and I understand". This proverb succinctly explains the concept of supplemental instruction. The goal of SI is not merely to raise the grades of students in problem courses, but rather to supply students in these courses with effective study skills, to enable them "to become more active, engaged and independent learners" (Zaritsky, 1994, p.2).

SI programs aim to increase student performance and retention by targeting traditionally difficult academic courses where high rates of D or F grades or withdrawals are consistently reported. All students enrolled in the problem classes are invited to participate in SI study sessions, which meet at regular times beginning the first week of the semester. Students receiving high letter grades in previous semesters are selected as SI leaders.

SI leaders attend all classes, take notes, and read all required materials to facilitate study sessions which match the material presented by the faculty teaching the course (Martin and Arendale, 1994). In addition to their prior knowledge of the course material, SI leaders attend a comprehensive training session prior to the semester and receive semester-long supervision provided by the SI supervisor. The SI supervisor is typically a student affairs administrator or academic advisor and is responsible for coordinating all aspects of the SI program.

SI sessions focus on combining basic study skills and study strategies. Study skills include note taking, preparing for exams, and effective textbook reading. Study strategies focus on methods of learning such as informal quizzes, the use of visual techniques to outline material, and lecture reviews (Martin and Arendale, 1992). During study sessions, informality and participation are encouraged. The SI leader serves as a group facilitator, rather than as an instructor. This participative model contrasts with the traditional, passive learning style of most lectures. These study sessions are often a more effective mode of teaching, because students' learning is enhanced when "active rather than passive strategies are used" (Astin, 1993, p.39).

Through the use of various study techniques and the reinforcement of good study skills, students attending SI programs have more academic success than their peers who do not attend SI sessions (Kenney, 1989). Kenney (1989) studied two sections of the same math class taught by the same professor. The study group attended SI sessions facilitated by a trained SI leader while the control group attended traditional review sessions facilitated by a teaching assistant. At the end of the semester the mean grade point average (GPA) for the control group was 2.51, but the SI group achieved a mean GPA of 2.95.

It should be stressed that SI is in no way a remedial program. The study sessions are open to all class participants, and the program focuses on traditionally difficult or high risk academic courses, rather than on students with academic problems (Zaritsky, 1994). Whereas remedial programs merely recap the material covered in lecture, the focus of SI sessions is somewhat different. SI sessions encourage students to "construct their own

knowledge" through interactive activities facilitated by the SI leader (Zaritsky, 1994, p.1).

Research by Martin and Arendale (1994) has highlighted the clear advantages provided by SI programs. Their research shows that over the last 10 years, SI programs have been implemented in 2875 college courses, and attendees have seen their grades increase by a half or full letter grade over those of non-attendees. These findings are supported by Zaritsky's (1994) study of a community college, which found that all the SI programs implemented therein showed increased passing rates and decreased failure rates.

In addition to the increase in grade point averages and passing rates, these programs may also have more subtle effects on their participants. SI programs encourage student involvement in out of class activities. The involvement of students in such peer groups can help to develop a sense of belonging to the institution, and may also lead to a higher likelihood of graduation (Astin, 1993). The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (as cited in Kuh, Shuh, and Whitt, 1991), suggested that students who spend more time engaged in the learning process are more likely to persist in college.

Several advantages of SI programs have been discussed above. However, some disadvantages do exist. Administratively, SI programs require considerable coordination. Each SI peer leader must be carefully selected for their academic and interpersonal skills (Martin & Arendale, 1994), receive training prior to the semester, and be supervised weekly during the semester. An institution must have sufficient professional staff willing to make significant time commitments to the SI program in order for it to operate effectively.

A significant concern facing administrators wishing to implement SI programs lies in garnering faculty support for the program. SI leaders must work closely with faculty teaching the targeted course. SI leaders need to have a clear understanding of the syllabus, be aware of exam requirements, and may even work with faculty to move exams until after scheduled SI sessions to allow students to adequately prepare (Zaritsky, 1994).

Perhaps the biggest problem facing administrators wishing to implement SI programs lies in convincing students that committing time and energy to study sessions each week will pay off (Zaritsky, 1994). Because SI is not a remedial program designed for at-risk students, and attendance is not mandatory, many students who could benefit from the academic support offered through SI programs may not see the need to attend these sessions.

SI has been shown to be a valuable resource for increasing the academic success of participants (Zaritsky, 1994; Kenney, 1989). Although study skills and techniques offered to students in a non-remedial setting have been shown to increase grades and may subsequently impact retention (Astin, 1993), the administrative commitments of SI programs are many. Student leaders must be selected, trained, and guided throughout the semester; faculty support must be generated; programs have to be developed and evaluated; and the involvement of professional staff must be secured.

As has been indicated, there are considerable administrative factors involved with implementing supplemental instruction programs. The benefits of supplemental instruction, however, would seem to far outweigh these organizational costs. By equipping students with more refined learning skills, involving them in interactive learning situations, and giving them the tools to improve their own performance, research has proven that supplemental instruction is an effective, positive way to enhance student academic success.

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kenney, P. A. (1989, March). *The effects of supplemental instruction on student performance in a college-level mathematics course.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Kuh, G. D., Shuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & associates. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Martin, D.C., & Arendale, D. R. (1992). Supplemental instruction: Improving first-year student success in high-risk courses. *The Freshman Year Experience: Monograph Series No. 7.*

Martin, D. C., & Arendale, D. R. (Eds.). (1994). *Supplemental instruction: Increasing achievement and retention.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moir, L. L., & Beverstock, C. (1994, March). *When regularly admitted students fail: A special course that succeeds.* Paper presented at the regional meeting of the National Academic Advisors Association, Cincinnati, OH.

Widmar, G. E. (1994). Supplemental instruction: From small beginnings to a national program. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning (60)* 3-10.

Zaritsky, J. (1994). *Supplemental instruction: A peer tutoring program at La Guardia Community College.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Community College General Education Association, Albany, NY.

Jane Eig is a second-year student in the HESA program. She graduated from the University of Central England, Birmingham, England in 1993 with a BA(Hons) in Business Studies. Prior to her enrollment in the masters program she was employed by the IU-Bloomington School of Continuing Studies, where she cultivated her interest in student affairs. During her course of study at IU, Jane has worked as a graduate assistant in the Student Activities Office, and is currently employed as a counselor in the Office of Student Financial Assistance.

Perceptions of Prospective Masters Students in Higher Education and Student Affairs

Tony Ellis, Carol McBryde, Barry Magee, Katrina Ross, and Rollie Buchanan

This qualitative study examines how perceptions of Indiana University-Bloomington and its Higher Education and Student Affairs graduate program affect students' choice to attend the institution. Results focus on six key factors in the decision making process: personal factors, perceptions of campus, perceptions of faculty and students, perceptions of academic program, perceptions of assistantship process, and social climate. This study provides important information about perceptions of educational settings and identifies trends useful for graduate student recruitment

The process of choosing a college has gained increased attention in recent years. Public policy regarding the availability of student financial aid and a declining pool of traditional-age students are two factors that have increased competition among institutions. Colleges and universities are now more interested in how prospective students choose institutions (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). If the anticipated five percent decline in the number of baccalaureate degree recipients by the year 2000 occurs, an increase in competition for quantity and quality of graduate students will also occur (Kallio, 1995).

Most of the existing literature that addresses the decisions students make focus on undergraduates. However, graduate students differ from undergraduate students in that they restrict their application process to fewer schools, are more constrained by educational and living costs, are affected by employment opportunities, and are more likely to make decisions based on families and significant others (Olson & King, 1985). Olson and King also state that examining variables that affect graduate school selection has not been a priority for many institutions because, until recently, few colleges and universities had ever experienced a decline in graduate enrollment or resources allocated toward graduate programs. Now there is a growing need for a better understanding of students' decision

making processes and selection of a graduate program (Kallio, 1995; Olson & King, 1985).

This study examines how perceptions of Indiana University-Bloomington (IUB) and its graduate preparation program in Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) affect students' choice. The goal of the study is to determine how perceptions affect the decision to enroll in an institution. Although this study focuses on a specific graduate program, it will offer insight into the effects of student perceptions on choice and increase the body of knowledge on graduate student choice in general.

Literature Review

The literature identifies two categories of factors which affect the decision making process of undergraduate students and which may apply to graduate student choices as well. One category is student characteristics which include demographic and personal attributes (race, sex, parental income, academic ability, etc.). The second is external student variables which include influence of family and institutional characteristics such as costs, location, and curricula (Olson & King, 1985).

College choice models for prospective undergraduate students can be applied to the graduate school selection process. "In general, these models suggest that the decision process consists of a number of stages or phases in which various individual and organizational factors interact to produce outcomes that influence the next stage or phase" (Kallio, 1995, p. 110). Hossler and Gallagher (1987) derived a three-phase decision making process model that includes predisposition, search, and choice. In the predisposition phase, students determine whether or not to continue their education. During the search phase, students gather information about institutions, often through on-campus visits. During the third and final phase, students make a decision based on the information gathered in the first two stages.

Research describing the factors that carry the most weight during the selection process varies. Kallio (1995) identified six factors on which prospective graduate students base their decisions: "residency status, characteristics of the academic environments of the institution and its programs, work-related concerns, spouse considerations, financial aid, and

the social environment of campus life" (p. 119). Of the six factors, residency, academic, and work influences appeared to have the greatest effect on graduate selection (Kallio, 1995). The most significant trend found in one longitudinal study was the increasing importance of a positive association with the personnel and faculty of the institution in the student decision process (Olson, 1992). Additionally, Astin (1993) found that interaction with a student-oriented faculty positively affected students' tendency to enroll in graduate school. Interaction with students from an institution also has a positive effect (Astin, 1993; McCormick, 1995). The reputation of a college or university appears to greatly affect the selection process (Cleave-Hogg,McLean, & Cappe, 1994; Matthews & Hadley, 1993). According to Sevier (1994), when students are asked to choose between their top reasons for their final selection of a college "they invariably choose image" (p. 61).

A small number of studies investigated specific graduate programs. Richmond and Sherman (1991) found that decisions made regarding student affairs preparation programs were influenced by geographical and financial assistance more than by the reputation of the program. In a study on medical school enrollment, Cleave-Hogg, et al. (1994) concluded that location and reputation of the program were major factors in student choice, while the type of program and family or friendship considerations were less important. Webb (1993) found that prospective business graduate students were influenced by the reputation and accreditation of an institution.

The study employs a perceptual framework in which personal interpretation serves as the basis for understanding how each individual experiences their environment. This is important in the college selection because according to the perceptual model, an individual's perception of the environment influences behavior (Strange, 1991). More specifically, Moos (1979) submits a model of social climate comprised of three sets of dimensions found in any environment: relationship, personal growth and development, and system maintenance and change. According to Moos (1979), "the social climate perspective is based on descriptions of environmental 'press' obtained from an inferred continuity and consistency in otherwise discrete events" (pp. 10-11).

The purpose of this study is to discover what affects prospective HESA masters students' decisions to attend IUB or another institution. Thus, this study assumes that prospective students' perceptions of IUB and its HESA program, perceptions of faculty and students, perceptions of academic requirements, and perceptions of personal and financial factors will affect their decisions.

Method

Participants

Twenty-one graduate students who applied as prospective students to the HESA department at IUB in the Spring of 1996 were interviewed for this study. Twenty of these students visited the IUB campus. However, because prospective students drop out at different points in the admission process, one student was interviewed who eliminated IUB before interview weekends occurred. Fifteen of the participants had chosen to attend IUB, while six had chosen to attend other student affairs programs. The sample was purposive: participants were chosen carefully in order to maximize the variety of experiences prior to interviewing at IUB and to attempt to have the sample represent the diversity that existed among the full group of participants. The sample included 6 men and 15 women. Sixteen participants were Caucasian, two African-American, one Biracial, one Hispanic, and one Filipino. The ethnic background of the sample was similar to the breakdown of the current students in the student affairs masters program at IUB.

The students' voluntary participation was requested by calling them on the telephone. Information about the study was then faxed or e-mailed to each interested individual. Each participant read and signed a Study Information Sheet before their interview.

Procedures

Each participant was interviewed by a member of the research team using an interview guide that was developed for this study (see Appendix). The interviews with students currently attending IUB were conducted either in person or over the telephone. The interviews with students at other institutions were conducted over the telephone. The Study Information

Sheet was faxed, e-mailed, or handed to participants just prior to the interview.

Each interview lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. Each included an opportunity for the interviewee to answer direct questions and to discuss other thoughts they had during the interview. All interviews were audio taped with the participants' permission. The first three interviews conducted were transcribed in full, the remaining interviews were partially transcribed. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) recommend this for studies with time and financial restraints. All interviews and notes were then reviewed by another member of the research team for accuracy of content and interpretation. Finally, a third researcher coded the data from the interview according to major themes. After all data was coded, the research team met to discuss the coding. Categories were collapsed and recombined based on the information that had been gathered. This process of coding data into categories and then reevaluating the categories was accomplished through the process described by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Member checks were conducted after the categories had been set. Twelve participants were contacted by e-mail and asked to comment on certain categories and several comments they had made to assure that the interpretation was correct. The final categories were personal factors, perceptions of campus, perceptions of faculty and students, perceptions of academic program, perceptions of assistantship, and social climate. These categories reflect the major themes found in the research, and so were used to organize the presentation of the results. All names have been changed to protect the identity of the participants.

Results

Personal Factors

Mentors. The involvement of mentors in the decision process was a seemingly powerful factor. Interestingly, the input on this topic was not included on the study instrument, yet 42.9% of the respondents discussed the issue. Furthermore, eight women discussed the importance of a mentor in their decision process, but only one man did. Mary, a Caucasian female, stated that her mentor completed the graduate degree at USC and encouraged her to apply to that program. Likewise, Judy a Caucasian female, knew a recent graduate of IUB, and several administrators that

were familiar with the IUB program, all of whom prompted her to apply. In addition, Carrie, a Caucasian female, was referred to the IUB program by professional mentors from her undergraduate residence life position.

Finances. Over half of the participants discussed the importance of financial concerns in their decision process. This supports findings from other studies (Olson & King, 1984; Kallio, 1995). Although not mentioned as often as admission to the academic program or the acquisition of an assistantship for admission and experiential purposes, financial incentive and tuition packages were important to several respondents. Judy considered it important to be in a program where the assistantship would pay for her education. William, a Caucasian male, stated, "I didn't want to take the chance of having to pay for my tuition. So it came down to a factor of money and time." Conversely, Rosa, a Hispanic female, commented that getting admitted was more important than the financial package.

Relationship. Of the ten respondents who reported being in a relationship during the selection process, only five mentioned relationship status as an influence on their decision. Three students already had a significant other in Bloomington. None of the students considered their relationship markedly influential due to a preexisting desire to attend IUB over other institutions based on more critical criteria. Janice, a Caucasian female with a fiancee in Indianapolis, chose to attend IUB over closer campuses, despite her relationship status.

Perceptions of Campus

Reputation of IUB. The reputation of the IUB campus was shadowed by perceptions of the IUB HESA program. Most participants who discussed *IUB*, were actually referring to the IUB HESA program. An important tie between these two topics was pointed out by Mona, a Caucasian female, who noted that "the reputation of the school is powerful in focusing on the reputation of the program." It was apparent that the reputation of IUB affected student choices in several cases.

Size of institution. Thirty-three percent of the students mentioned size as a factor. Athena, a Filipino female, thought that one of the other schools she interviewed with was "too small." However, four respondents had negative things to say about IUB's size. Cindy, a Caucasian female,

considered the large size of IUB its one drawback, stating that "it was intimidating."

Appearance of campus. Only seven respondents commented about the appearance of the campus. Four respondents found the IUB campus to be aesthetically pleasing and thus a more desirable place to attend. Hershey, a Caucasian male, shared that "the physical campus I thought was very pretty. It was also very well maintained." He found this comforting in its similarity to his undergraduate institution. Athena commented on the unpleasant appearance of another campus and its affect on her decision to attend IUB. Reginald, a biracial male, found that his expectations of the IUB campus were inflated. "The campus was not what I thought it would be. I wasn't as impressed as I thought I would be."

Location. Location of the campus played a role in the decision process of eight participants for various reasons. Reginald commented that IUB was closer to his parents than his undergraduate institution had been or other graduate programs he was considering. Mona wanted to be in the Midwest. Athena noted that one institution was not in a good location due to its climate. Erika, an African-American female, noted that one institution she considered was "in a cornfield." Interest in the host city of the institution was heard in several other responses as well. Athena commented that the host city of IUB had more to offer than the area surrounding one of her other top choices.

Perceptions of Faculty and Students

Interaction with faculty. One of the most important factors influencing participants' decisions was interaction with faculty. Nineteen participants (91%) discussed interaction with the faculty as influencing their decision process. Ten of the 19 respondents considered the interaction with faculty cursory or just a part of the interview process. Betty, a Caucasian female, felt "looked down upon" by the faculty at IUB. Further, she noted that other institutions treated candidates as potential colleagues, not as potential students. Jackie, a Caucasian female, considered her faculty interactions at IUB poor.

Conversely, some students enjoyed their interaction with the faculty at IUB and other institutions. Brett, a Caucasian male, really enjoyed the faculty interview and considered the faculty component an important part of the decision process. Kendra, a Caucasian female, noted that she met "a couple of great faculty." Erika thought, "At Western, faculty had more personal contact with students." Three participants who had attended IUB as undergraduates stated that long-term relationships with faculty or administrators in the program were influential in their decision process.

Interaction with prospective students. The opportunity to interact with other prospective students was tied to attending an organized interview weekend. Seven participants offered comments on this topic. Half of the men in the study felt that interaction with prospective students was important. Bobby, a Caucasian male, liked the personal connection he gained with his future colleagues. Kendra thought getting to know other prospective students was important because "you're going to be working together." Elroy, a Caucasian male, thought less of one school he visited because the interview process was limited to three candidates per trip and did not allow him to interact with more of his potential classmates. However, Elroy also noted that this design offered a "personal touch" and "quality time" to each candidate.

Interaction with current students. There were mixed responses to the interaction with current students in the academic program. Four participants felt deceived or "put off" by the students in the program with whom they interviewed or interacted. Carrie considered the people at every school as being on their "best behavior" and saw no real distinctions.

The remaining seven respondents on this topic considered their interaction with current students as a positive influence, particularly when respondents perceived those students as being honest and straightforward. As Kendra asserted, "The first and second year students that I did meet were the most helpful of anyone. . . . they pretty much told me how it was gonna be, and that's what I wanted to know. . . . That really sold me on the program."

Perceptions of Academic Program

A strong majority (85.7%) of the students offered comments regarding positive perceptions of the academic program. Four of the six respondents that now attend other institutions had positive perceptions of the IUB

program. These comments fell into two categories, those related to the perceived reputation of the program and those related to program focus. In the first category, students spoke of gathering information regarding the reputation of the program from student affairs professionals, mentors, and other prospective students. In the second category, students talked about program focus being administrative, counseling, or academic/research based.

Perceptions of Assistantship Process

The topic of assistantships was popular among respondents, with 71% discussing some aspect as important to their decision process. Because assistantships are required in the IUB program, availability and the interview process were important to candidates. The organization of the interview process was discussed by several respondents as being poorer at IUB than at other schools. Ten had negative perceptions of the assistantship process at IUB. Some students looked more fondly on institutions that provided better organized and more timely processes for interviewing and issuance of offers.

Another theme under this topic was the availability of positions. Several students indicated a desire for a specific position. Sue, a Caucasian female, would not have attended IUB if she had not been offered the assistantship she desired. Furthermore, participants had the perception that IUB offered few positions outside of residence life. Mary, who chose not to attend IUB, stated that the IUB process focused on housing. LaShanta, an African-American female who chose IUB, suggested that if you are "not interested in [residence life], go elsewhere."

Timing. The timeline institutions used when making offers of assistantship positions was also important to prospective students. Numerous comments suggested that IUB made offers too late or without other pertinent communication to remain competitive in candidates' search. At least three students' decisions were affected by receiving an offer from another institution prior to hearing from IUB or by not having an offer issued by a rival institution on their list. William waited a week for an offer from IUB and, after receiving none, committed to another institution. Likewise, Mary contacted IUB two weeks after her interview and there was no decision on positions. She selected another institution. Overall, the

assistantship process was one of the most influential factors on the decision process of prospective students. Erika, speaking about the assistantship, asserted, "I would have to say that was what determined what school I attended."

Social Climate

One theme not included in our original assumptions, but which came up repeatedly during the interviews, is the idea of "comfort" and "fit." Sue states, "You've got to get a program that you think will fit with you." The words "comfort" and "fit" were specifically used by 57.1% of those interviewed when talking about factors that influenced their decision making process. However, these terms were also used in a more general way by the participants. Bobby's questions, "Will this fit for me? Is this what I'm looking for?" were similar to many others' general statements of "fit."

In reviewing the data the researchers questioned how to categorize the general concept of "fit" and "comfort." Brett gave us the answer. During the interview stage he recounted his visit to Michigan which coincided with "Hash Bash." He stated, "I didn't care for it . . . I could tell, it wasn't a good fit for me." As a part of the member check process, Brett was asked in a follow-up phone call to define "fit" in this context. He stated:

> I suppose it has to do with a feeling of being welcome in an environment by the people, the available opportunities, the institution, even the climate and the campus artifacts. I feel it's important to find a comfort level available in an environment....I just simply wasn't completely comfortable in that environment as I recall.

Brett's comments and those of several other participants supported Moos perceptual model of person-environment interaction, particularly his focus on the social climate's influence on the people who inhabit it. Our data supports Moos' (1979) relationship dimension (involving interpersonal relations among the people in the environment) and the personal development dimension (relating to growth opportunities made possible by the environment). The researchers categorized these uses as "social climate influences." William recommended that other prospective students spend an adequate amount of time on campus during the interview process to

determine fit with the general attitude of the student body. LaShanta insisted on talking to other minority students about IUB and the community to determine "atmosphere" and "fit." During member checks she stated:

> Because I am a minority I sometimes feel that starting over is a little more of a trying experience. When I was asking about atmosphere, I was seeking information on how difficult it would be for me to be here. . . . .in the end, I decided that . . . there was enough of a fit for me to be reasonably happy here for two years.

Discussion

Moos (1979) asserted, and this study supports, that students' perceptions provide needed and important information about educational settings. Additionally, this study supports the research of Kallio (1995) and Olson (1992) in finding that faculty interaction, work related concerns, financial aid, and relationship status are important considerations during the process of choosing a graduate program. This study found trends useful to faculty and administrators for graduate student recruitment and retention efforts. The study also provides a better understanding of perceptions held by students and how their decisions are influenced by the perceived factors forming the choice process.

Mentors, assistantships, and social climate were factors that were found to be important during the decision-making process. These factors had not been identified as significant in previous research. Moreover, the importance of mentors in the decision process is underscored by the spontaneity of its mention.

A number of limitations to the study must be acknowledged. First, the use of a small sample from a single university is prohibitive of generalization to other campuses. However, this study does show the need for future studies spanning various universities and/or programs. Second, interviewer bias is also a consideration because each researcher recently went through a similar decision process and the researchers have personal relationships with some of the members of the sample. Third, time influenced the study in that it was conducted over a 15-week time period and several months after the participants actual decision making process. In addition, Pennington, Zvonkovic, and Wilson (1989) found that student

satisfaction was lowest at midterm. Since most of the interviews in this study occurred very close to midterm, satisfaction reported in this study may be lower than if reported at another time during the semester. Fourth, the subjective perceptions of participants are open to varying interpretation. Finally, the participants' exposure to their college of choice since the final decision may have changed measured perceptions.

In conclusion, faculty and administrators should remain aware of the impact of all of the factors mentioned above on prospective Masters Students' decision making process. In particular, institutions should continue or improve the fostering of relationships with alumni and other student affairs professionals as an important recruitment tool. Program administrators should also devote energy to providing adequate information to prospective students regarding assistantships. Institutions should take heed of students' need to feel comfortable in their environment. More interaction with faculty and students may provide a method of gaining answers to their questions. Some of the participants in this study made crucial decisions based on limited information, potentially establishing inappropriate expectations. Finally, institutional representatives should offer prospective students insight into the social climate of the institution and the surrounding community to aid in their decision making.

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cleave-Hogg, D., McLean, A. G., & Cappe, L. E. (1994). Factors affecting applicants' acceptance or decline of offers to enroll in a medical school. *College and University, 69,* 104- 109.

Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. S. (1987). Studying student college choice: A three-phase model and the implications for policy makers. *College and University, 62,* 207-221.

Kallio, R. E. (1995). Factors influencing the college choice decisions of graduate students. *Research in Higher Education, 36,* 109-124.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Matthews, M. J., & Hadley, T. D. (1993). The relationship between and institution's perceived quality and students' application sets. *College and University, 68,* 22-30.

McCormick, J. F. (1995). "But, nobody told me about . . . ": A program for enhancing decision making by college-bound students. *The School Counselor, 42,* 246-248.

Moos, R. H. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Olson, C. (1992). Is your institution user-friendly? Essential elements of successful graduate student recruitment. *College and University, 67*(3), 203-214.

Olson, C., & King, M. A. (1985). A preliminary analysis of the decision process of graduate students in college choice. *College and University, 60,* 304-315.

Pennington, D. C., Zvonkovic, A. M., & Wilson, S. L. (1989). Changes in college satisfaction across an academic term. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 528-535.

Richmond, W., & Sherman, K. J. (1991). Student-development preparation and placement: A longitudinal study of graduate students. *Journal of College Student Development, 32,* 8-16.

Sevier, R. A. (1994). Image is everything: Strategies for measuring, changing, and maintaining your institution's image. *College and University, 69*(2), 60-75.

Strange, C. (1991). Managing college environments: theory and practice. In T. K. Miller, R. B. Winston, Jr., & M. J. Barr (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education* (pp. 159-199). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development, Inc.

Webb, M. S. (1993). Variables influencing graduate business students' college selections. *College and University, 68*(1), 38-46.

Appendix - Interview Guide

Introduction: Thank you, again, for agreeing to interview with me. As described on the consent form, this study is intended to investigate the perceptions held by prospective graduate students that influenced their decision to attend IUB or another graduate program in college student personnel or a related field.

To begin, I would like to take some descriptive information...

Name: _____ Age: _____

Phone: _____ (if applicable) Consent form: _____

Gender: _____ Relationship Status: _____

Ethnicity: _____

Undergrad. Inst.: _____ Date of Grad.: _____

Activities since graduation (i.e. professional employment):

To what other graduate programs or institutions did you apply?

Of those programs/institutions, with which schools did you interview?

Did your interviews include campus visits? If so, would you like to elaborate on any elements (i.e. the physical campus, faculty, or student group)?

What assistantships did you apply to at Indiana University-Bloomington?

What assistantships did you apply to at other institutions?

Thanks for allowing me to gather that background information. Now I would like to start off with a general question or two and see where the conversation takes us...

1) What factors influenced your decision upon which graduate institution to attend?
2) What specifically about IUB prompted you to attend or not attend?
3) If the following factors have not yet been covered in the discussion, additional questions can be posed:

Relationship status	Interaction with students
Assistantship/financial aid	Interaction with faculty
Reputation of IUB	Reputation of HESA program

4) Have you been pleased with your chosen program? Why or why not?
5) Looking back at the decision process, what insight might you offer, for example, to a prospective student this spring?

Tony Ellis is a 1997 graduate of Indiana University in HESA. He is currently the Education & Media Coordiantor for the Association of

College Unions International Central Office staff. Prior to entering IU, Tony worked for Kappa Alpha Order, national men's social fraternity, as a travelling consultant and Coordinator of Educational Programming.

Carol McBryde gradauted from the HESA master's program in May, 1997. While at Indiana University, she was an Assistant Coordinator in Foster Quad. She graduated from Texas A&M University in 1995 with a B.S. in Agricultural Development.

Barry Magee is a doctoral student in IU's HESA program. At IU, he has worked as an Assistant Coordinator for the McNutt Residence Center and a Diversity Education Specialist for Residence Life.

Katrina Ross graduated from the HESA program in 1997, and served as an academics assistant in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics at IU. Previously, she worked for four years ar Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference (Metro Conference) in compliance and communications. She received a B.S. in broadcast journalism from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1990.

Rollie O. Buchanan received his B.G.S. in general studies (1991) and M.S. in higher education and student affairs (1997) from Indiana University. Prior to returning to IU, Rollie served as a residence hall director at the University of Wisconsin - River Falls for four years. At IU, Rollie served as Associate Coordinator for Residence Life & Director of the Thomas I. Atkins Living Learning Center in Ashton Residence Center.

Minority Admissions Policies and the Courts: What's a School to Do?

Ryan Forsythe

Recent legal cases have defined admissions policies which differ for minorities and nonminorities as racist and illegal. This paper examines the challenge of reconciling institutional commitment to diversity with these legal decisions. The options available to institutions are considered, followed by suggested directions for administrators.

In 1992, four applicants who were denied admission to the University of Texas Law School sued the school and claimed that their rights under the Fourteenth Amendment had been violated (Edley, 1996). The law school used different test score requirements for minorities than for non-minorities when making admissions decisions. Based on a "Texas Index" score (a function of LSAT scores and undergraduate grade point average), applicants were divided into three categories: those who would likely be offered admission, those who would likely be denied admission, and those who would receive more scrutiny before a decision was made ("Admissions," 1996). To be in the admit category, white students required a score of 199, while preferred minorities required a score of 189.

The case, *Hopwood v. State of Texas*, was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, which refused to hear it. As a result, the decision remained that "the law school may not use race as a factor in law school admissions" (Admissions, 1996, p. 1187). The decision of the court indicated a belief that using a higher criteria for one group of applicants constitutes discrimination.

A closer look at standardized tests reveals that utilizing the same criteria for all individuals may discriminate against members of certain groups. Critics of standardized tests believe the tests are biased (Beaver, 1996). FairTest is an advocacy group that monitors such tests. The group argues that many of the concepts of the Scholastic Aptitude Test refer to elements of white culture with which minority students might not be familiar. They cite a question that over 50% of white students answered

correctly, yet less than 25% of black students answered correctly "thus demonstrating bias against blacks" (Beaver, 1996, p. 37).

Furthermore, some studies have demonstrated that learning test-taking strategies can increase scores on a retest (Beaver, 1996). Some companies claim their strategies can increase scores by at least 100 points. The result is that students who can afford expensive courses are able to increase their scores. In summary, by using the same cut-off scores for all students, universities might be discriminating against low-income students who are unable to afford such courses and against minority students not familiar with aspects of the dominant culture.

Therefore, the use of a single cut-off, regardless of the race or economic background of the applicant, might harm an institution's attempts to maintain a diverse student body. Using differential standards opens schools to charges of overt racism, but using a single standard might provide cause for claims of covert racism. Colleges and universities are searching for a suitable response to this dilemma.

One position taken by some schools is to do nothing until legislation or court decisions clearly state what action is appropriate (Edley, 1996). The issue these schools are dealing with is the apparent contradiction between what appears to be fair and what has been dictated as legal. It may be appropriate for universities to continue policies they believe are fair or beneficial to minorities until courts require them to act otherwise.

However, colleges and universities must not sit by as the courts take away important policies. In the *Hopwood* decision, "the court of appeals held that the law school had presented no evidence supporting a compelling reason to warrant the elevation of some races over other" ("Admissions," 1996, p. 1187). As defendants, colleges and universities must understand their own position and defend the policies with the proper evidence.

Student affairs administrators have at their disposal data that indicate the educational benefits of having a diverse student population. According to Astin (1993), "there are many developmental benefits that accrue to students when institutions encourage and support an emphasis on multiculturalism and diversity" (p. 431). Student experiences in areas of

diversity positively affect satisfaction, cognitive and affective development, and commitment to promoting racial understanding (Astin, 1993). Providing this information to legislatures and courts may allow them greater understanding of the benefits of a diverse student body. In time, legislation and legal decisions may reflect the influence of this perspective.

Another option for colleges would be to accept the decisions of the courts and create new policies that maintain the spirit of the prior policies. However, few schools have taken this stance. The most appropriate response to the criticisms may be to eliminate the use of standardized test scores as an admission criterion. Beaver (1996) found that of all students taking the SAT, approximately five percent are not admitted to any college. If 95% of students are getting into the institutions that they applied to regardless of SAT scores, then the scores would seem unimportant.

Marchese (1996) indicated that the focus of the college admissions process on test scores and GPAs resulted in student perceptions that these were the most important factors in determining admission. By placing greater emphasis in the admissions process on non-cognitive dimensions of student achievement, such as involvement in extracurriculars, universities will send the message to students, legislatures, and courts, that test scores are not as valuable as once thought. Conceivably, universities will have greater flexibility in admitting students from various racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds as a result of relaxing the attention devoted to test scores.

In the wake of the *Hopwood* decision, it is necessary for colleges and universities to examine policies regarding minority students (Marchese, 1996). Institutions of higher education cannot sit idle while courts continue to undermine the progress of affirmative action programs. Colleges and universities must be at the forefront of any discussions regarding their policies. Only then can they insure that their educational missions remain intact.

References

Admissions: Affirmative action using race as factor; Equal protection. (1996, June). *The College Student and the Courts,* pp. 1185-1187.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beaver, W. (1996). Is it time to replace the SAT? *Academe, 82*(3), 37-39.

Edley, C. (1996). Affirmative action angst: Contemplating campus policy after *Hopwood v. Texas. Change, 28*(5), 12-15.

Marchese, E. (1996). After *Hopwood. Change, 28*(5), 4.

Ryan Forsythe graduated from The Ohio State University in 1996 with a B.A. in English and a B.S. in Psychology. He is a first-year student in the HESA program and is planning a May 1998 graduation. At IU, Ryan has worked as an Assistant Coordinator in the McNutt Residence Center.

Free Speech and Campus Hate Speech Codes

Stephanie Sue Helmers

During the 1980s and 90s the issue of free speech and campus hate speech codes came to the forefront of the student affairs profession. Institutions went to battle in the courts over the issue especially as related to constitutionality. This paper revisits the controversy , the issues involved, and the results of the legal battle over the last few decades. The author asks student affairs professionals to look at their role as educators and use this as a tool to solve this continuing problem.

> Campus racism posed another of the classic 'hard cases' where the free speech advocates are forced to defend the rights of some with utterly despicable points of view. As First Amendment authority Rodney Smolla put it, hate speech posed 'the hardest free speech question of all.' (Walker, 1994, p. 135-136)

The concern with a perceived resurgence of racism on college campuses across the nation has created one of the most highly contested free speech issues in modern society (Laramee, 1991; Walker, 1994). At the center of the debate are terms and concepts such as racism and sexism, hate speech codes, academic mission statements, freedom of speech and equality. Some argue this is the toughest free speech issue which American society has yet to resolve. Others arguing from a pro- (or con-) campus hate speech code stance can see no justification for the tolerance of (or attempts to silence) words that categorize, stereotype, and offend persons based solely on their membership in a certain segment of society.

In order to encourage a greater understanding of the controversy between campus hate speech codes and free speech, this paper examines the key areas of the debate. First, a general introduction to the recent phenomenon of campus hate speech codes is presented. This section includes the search for a common definition of hate speech, a look at what caused the proliferation of hate speech codes, and a discussion of what the codes are designed to do as well as how they have been judged in the courts. The second section explains the arguments of those who support

campus hate speech codes. In the third section, the arguments against the codes are presented. The final section provides discussion of the controversy, values and arguments involved and presents a recommendation for moving forward in finding some resolution amidst the controversy.

An Introduction to Campus Hate Speech Codes

It is important to first try to come to a common understanding of just what is meant by hate speech. While the definitions are multiple and varied, Kaplin (1992) gives a good summary of what constitutes a common definition. He writes:

> The term 'hate speech,' as commonly understood, refers to verbal and written words, and to symbolic acts, that convey a grossly negative assessment of particular persons or groups based on their race, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability. Hate speech thus is highly derogatory and degrading, and the language is typically coarse. The purpose of hate speech is more to humiliate or wound that it is to communicate ideas or information. Epithets, slurs, insults, taunts, and threats are common labels used to describe hate speech. (Kaplin, 1992, p. 518)

Hate speech is not limited in its form, forum or function. It occurs daily. Often times it goes unrecognized. Furthermore, members of the majority class in the United States are often unaware of the many subtle forms of hate speech which have been institutionalized in American society (Matsuda, 1993).

In the mid-1980s incidents of hate speech and campus prejudice shook the foundations of colleges and universities across the nation. "The National Institute against Prejudice and Violence counted a total of 250 incidents of bigotry on campus from 1986 to 1989" (Walker, 1994, p. 130). This number includes only those cases reported to college officials. Walker (1994) explains the impact statistics like these had on college and university administration:

> "It had always been an article of faith among the educated elite that education was the best antidote to prejudice...Consequently the series of racist incidents among the most talented students in the nation was truly shocking" (p. 130).

In response, campus hate speech codes were born. "The campus hate speech codes were the product of a frightening rash of racist incidents on college and university campuses" (Walker, 1994, p. 129). The codes were created out of a concern for equality and human dignity and contain in them an appeal to reason, tolerance and moral treatment of fellow human beings (Smolla, 1993). Emphasizing the importance of these values, campus hate speech codes seek to discipline students who publicly participate in acts of hate speech (Jost, 1993).

At the heart of the campus hate speech code controversy is the balancing of the values of equality and free speech. Celis (1992) explains:

> The institution of these codes has roiled many campuses, as students, administrators and faculty members have struggled to balance the need to counter growing racism and bias with the need to promote the free exchange of ideas necessary to the functioning of the university. (p. A11)

Campus hate speech codes seek to guarantee equal access in the marketplace of ideas and in the pursuit of education for all members of the university community.

At the peak of the campus hate speech code movement of the 1980s, between 200 and 300 colleges and universities instituted policies which attempted to deal with incidents of hate speech (Jost, 1993). These codes "generally forbid language that demeans individuals on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability or age" (Bernstein, 1993, p. E3). However, these regulations "vary widely in the scope of what they prohibit" (Altman, 1993, p. 303).

The courts have given little legal support for policies at public universities. Three cases are of particular importance when discussing campus hate speech codes. In *Doe v. University of Michigan* (September 22, 1989), a federal court struck down a policy of discriminatory harassment which "permitted the disciplining of anyone found guilty of any

behavior, verbal or physical that stigmatized or victimized someone on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, handicap, or Vietnam-era veteran status" (Jost, 1993, p. 18) on the basis that "it was too broad because it applied to constitutionally protected speech and too vague because it was simply impossible to discern any limitation on its scope" (Jost, 1993, p. 18).

The second case came two years later. In *UWM v. Board of Regents* (October 1991) a federal court judge ruled that the policy against hate speech at the University of Wisconsin Madison was too vague and that "it went beyond the narrow category of 'fighting words'" (Jost, 1993, p. 18). The judge struck down the code which prohibited "discriminatory comments, epithets, and abusive language that demeaned someone on the basis of race, sex, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, or age" that were directed at a specific individual (Jost, 1993, p. 18).

Finally, the U.S. Supreme Court entered its verdict in *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul* (June 1991). In this case, the Court "created a new free speech doctrine that appears to prohibit any governmental action that singles out a particular subject matter or particular viewpoint for punishment" (Jost, 1993, p. 18). While not dealing explicitly with the issue of campus hate speech codes, but rather with governmental agencies who impose speech codes, the case does affect colleges and universities in a broader sense. Given the Court's decision, public institutions of higher learning would no longer be able to legally uphold campus hate speech codes because of their affiliation with the government. Under the *R.A.V.* ruling, public or governmental offices and agencies (including institutions of higher education) are strictly forbidden from engaging in the content and viewpoint discrimination which hate speech codes bring to the table.

It is important to note that these cases apply solely to public institutions. Private colleges have the legal right to implement hate speech codes. While they are free to use these policies, many private colleges follow the lead of legal decisions regarding their public counterparts, because they want to be held to the same standards (Celis, 1992).

Arguments for Campus Hate Speech Codes

The starting point for a majority of supporters of hate speech codes lies in the history of American society. They argue that the traditional segregation and classification of individuals and groups of persons in American society gives a special power to hate speech. Furthermore, when contrasted with the Fourteenth Amendment (which extends the privilege of citizenship and guarantees equal protection of the law to all persons) and the principle of equality, an endorsement of hate speech can become antithetical to the very principles of the modern social contract. Sunstein (1993) explains:

> In view of our history, invective directed against minority groups, and racist speech in general, create fears of physical violence, exclusion, and subordination that are not plausibly described as mere 'offense.' These harms are plausibly antithetical to the goal of political equality, a precondition for democracy and a goal that animates the First Amendment itself...In light of all this, there is nothing obvious or clear about the view that the First Amendment should ban laws prohibiting racial hate speech. (p. 186)

Lawrence (1993) makes a similar argument. He views the Constitution in a holistic manner calling for the recognition of the values inherent in its framing. He contends that the values of the First Amendment are frustrated when we fail to consider the circumstances in which they are enacted in modern society.

Proponents of campus hate speech codes argue that if we want to achieve equality we must make safeguards for the individuals who are not power-holders (Matsuda, 1993). While opponents argue this creates an infringement on First Amendment rights, the supporters of hate speech codes do not see this as a plausible argument. In fact, proponents of campus hate speech codes argue the First Amendment warrants protection of the victim of hate speech (Matsuda, 1993).

Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have recognized this concern for the victims of hate speech. Justice White, writing the dissenting opinion of *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul* (1991), recognized the reasonable and justifiable nature of the city's ordinance "in light of our nation's long and painful

experience with discrimination" (as cited. in Greenhouse, 1992, p. A11). Similar to those who argue for hate speech codes, Justice White takes a contextualized view of history and the law to render an opinion which favors the Fourteenth Amendment over the First.

The second major argument used to support campus hate speech codes centers around the idea of equal opportunity in education. Persons on both sides of the debate have long supported education as the solution to inequality (Forney, 1996). If this is the case then educational institutions need to be accepting and supportive of all persons. O'Neil (1992) explains, "Universities also have a special need to establish an environment hospitable to persons who have felt unwelcome there for far too long, and whose very ability to learn may depend on civility and respect" (p. A40). Campus hate speech codes are offered as the means to achieving this end. O'Neil (1992) continues, "many institutions rightly feel that they need to do more than simply make strong statements or even promote educational programs designed to increase sensitivity and enhance the campus climate" (p. A40).

A corollary argument extended from the right of educational pursuit is the argument against a hostile environment. Walker (1994) explains, "speech code advocates argued that maintaining a nonhostile campus environment was necessary to achieve the goal of equal educational opportunity: the victims of attack would tend to drop out of school or not enroll at all" (p. 141). The Department of Education seems to recognize this as a legitimate concern. Lewis (1995), who adamantly opposes campus hate speech codes, reports that "[the Federal Department of Education] threatens to withhold Federal aid from any university with a 'hostile environment' in terms of race — and similar gender rules are being prepared" (p. A15).

Closely tied to this idea, and a third main line of argumentation in favor of campus hate speech codes, is the appeal to a consideration of the victim, the victim's feelings, and the power s/he has to respond to hostile speech acts. Kaplin (1992) demonstrates the link between the victim's feeling and the ability to engage in an active pursuit of education:

> The feelings of vulnerability, insecurity, and alienation that repeated incidents of hate speech engender in the victimized groups may undermine the conditions necessary to constructive dialogue on campus. Members of the victimized groups, moreover, may be unable to take full advantage of the educational opportunities available at the university. (p. 519)

Lawrence (1993) comments on the experience of African-American students and the psychic injury invoked by hate speech:

> It is clear that racist speech causes tangible injury, and it is the kind of injury for which the law commonly provides, and even requires, redress. Psychic injury is no less an injury than being struck in the face, and it often is far more severe. *Brown [v. Board of Education]* speaks directly to the psychic injury inflicted by racist speech in noting that the symbolic message of segregation affected the "hearts and minds" of Negro children "in a way unlikely ever to be undone." Racial epithets and harassment often cause deep emotional scarring and feelings of anxiety and fear that pervade every aspect of a victim's life. (p. 74)

Moreover, Lawrence argues that the overwhelming emotional response combined with the institutionalization of hate speech effectively silences the targets of hate speech, leaving them with little or no defense. "When one is personally attacked with words that denote one's sub-human status and untouchability, there is little, if anything, that can be said to redress either the emotional or reputational injury" (Lawrence, 1993, p. 68).

A final means of supporting campus hate speech codes relies on the classification of hate speech as conduct. In fact, some proponents argue that the rules and regulations surrounding hate speech adopted by colleges and universities should not be viewed as speech codes at all. Iris Brest of Stanford argues, "We think about it as a policy about conduct and discrimination. We think that private schools have a right to adopt student conduct regulations, including ones like this" (as cited in Hanson, 1994, p. 15). While this distinction can be rather tricky, Lawrence (1993) argues it is not:

> My suggestion that racist conduct amounts to speech is premised upon a characteristic of racism—namely its reliance upon the defamatory message of white supremacy to achieve its injurious purpose...Racism is both 100 percent speech and 100 percent conduct. (p. 60-62)

Again, this would appear to be an area where there is legal support for campus hate speech codes. Justice Stevens, writing in a dissenting opinion of *R.A.V.*, expressed his support for such a distinction when he contended that the nation must mature beyond the current state of tension regarding race relations before hate speech codes are deemed inappropriate. Until such maturation, Stevens argues, "...laws such as St. Paul's ordinance will remain reasonable and justifiable" (as cited in Greenhouse, 1992, p. A11).

Arguments against Campus Hate Speech Codes

If equality is the starting point for those who support campus hate speech codes, then freedom of speech is the starting point for those who oppose them. Those opposing speech codes argue that they strike a blow to the bedrock principle of freedom and democracy—the right to hold one's opinion and express it freely within the society. Dodge (1992) explains, "The codes...have been criticized by officials of the American Civil Liberties Union and others who believe they violate the free-speech rights of students and, in some cases, of faculty and staff members" (p. A35).

As evidenced in legal decisions surrounding the issue, those who stake their claims in the First Amendment have legal backing and precedent on their side. For example, in 1995 the Santa Clara Superior Court struck down the Stanford University speech code which "sought to shield students from bigotry by banning insults on race and sex" ("Court," 1995, p. B8). Robert Corry, one of the students suing the university, commented, "This is a victory for academic freedom and free speech" (as cited in "Court," 1995, p. B8).

The federal courts also struck down hate speech codes in *Doe* and *UWM* on the basis that they violated free speech principles of the First Amendment. The Supreme Court has also ruled against hate speech codes on the basis that they violate freedom of speech. In *Texas v. Johnson* (1989) the Court determined that "if there is a bedrock principle underlying

the First Amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable" (Kaplin, 1992, p. 520). Legally, it appears as though those in opposition to hate speech codes have the upper hand.

Opponents are tying into the idea of academic freedom as well. Walker (1994) explains how "many saw the codes as the most serious threat to freedom of expression and to academic freedom since the worst years of the Cold War" (p. 143). Opponents of campus hate speech codes argue that, because the university is a place for growth and exchange of ideas, it is detrimental to the philosophy of higher education to allow speech to be banned or curbed from the marketplace even if it is speech the majority finds offensive. Altman (1993) explains the importance of free expression at the university in contrast to the larger society: "Freedom of expression is far more vital to the role of the university than it is to that of the typical workplace, and so it is reasonable to think that university rules should be less restrictive of free speech" (p. 308).

Arguing that hate speech contains ideas, opponents of hate speech codes claim that the mission of institutions of higher education compels tolerance of said ideas. They argue these ideas should not be summarily dismissed on a value judgement. Robert O'Neil explains, "As much as hateful speech represents an idea, however abhorrent, the university community is not a place where we should suppress ideas" (as cited in Jaschik, 1992, p. A22).

Others are more adamant about the threat hate speech codes pose to the spirit of academia. Accuracy in Academia, a Washington-D.C.-based group, recently stated, "academic freedom is threatened by a progressive ideological orthodoxy," namely, campus hate speech codes (as cited in Rabinovitz, 1996, p. A31). Additionally, Johnsen (1936) writes:

> The responsibility of the university as a whole is to the community at large, and any restriction upon the freedom of the instructor is bound to react injuriously upon the efficiency and morale of the institution, and therefore ultimately upon the interests of the community. (p. 156)

According to this line of reasoning, the more ideas one has the better. Any limits placed on free speech cause the number of ideas in the marketplace to be limited and society suffers a detriment as a result.

Along these same lines, there are opponents who argue that not only do hate speech codes impinge on academic freedom and freedom of thought, but that they "create a totalitarian atmosphere in which everyone would have to guard his tongue all the time lest he say something that someone finds offensive" (Lewis, 1995, p. A15). Even administrators question the effectiveness of a rule-based approach towards dealing with hate speech. Sue Wasiolek, Dean for Student Life at Duke University, comments:

> It bothers me about our society in general that the only way people think they can change behavior is to set up a rule. Our mission is to facilitate the exchange of differences and different opinions—not to brainwash people. (as cited in Dodge, 1992, p. A36)

Another main argument opponents have against campus hate speech codes is that they are ineffective. Those who favor an open atmosphere on college campuses feel that codes only detract from the problem and make no concerted effort to deal with the real issue. Mark Green, a New York Public Advocate, in an appearance on *The Firing Line* argued that codes and labels such as "politically correct" deter progress on the issues of equality and racism. Green urges university and college officials, "Let's eliminate the phrase and get on with the unfinished business of transforming our society and transforming our educational institutions" ("Speaking," 1995).

In light of such arguments, administrators themselves are beginning to recognize the ineffectiveness of speech codes. Victor DeJesus, co-president of the Wisconsin Student Association, had originally supported a hate speech code but "changed his mind because he felt the regents were using it as an excuse to avoid the real problems of minority students" ("U.," 1992, p. A10). Still other administrators say the codes are simply not needed. Dodge (1992) explains, "Officials on campuses that have not instituted hate-speech policies say that students do not have to be punished to understand the effect their remarks had on others. Those officials say

their experiences prove that hate speech codes aren't needed" (p. A36). "Moreover, some colleges, Tufts University and the University of Pennsylvania, for example, have voluntarily rescinded speech codes after concluding they were ineffectual, divisive or illegal" (Lubman, 1993, p. A1).

Conclusion

The issue of campus hate speech codes brings to the forefront a deep conflict between two of the most valued principles of American society. This controversy centers around equality and freedom of speech. Those who uphold campus hate speech codes contend they serve to further the principles of equality and equal opportunity guaranteed to each person under the Fourteenth Amendment. Those who oppose them cite the First Amendment and argue that the codes strike a blow to the bedrock principles of our society.

The arguments for both sides of the campus hate speech code debate are convincing and telling of the predicament of American society. They call on its spectators to make a decision about which rights are held necessary and vital to the functioning of society and question the notion of free speech in America. Perhaps most important of all, it questions whether values need to be adjusted in recognition of how notions of freedom and equality have been formed and influenced in the course of history.

References

Altman, A. (1993). Liberalism and campus hate speech: A philosophical examination. *Ethics, 103*(2), 302.

Bernstein, R. (1993, May 30). Cap, gown and gag: the struggle for control. *The New York Times*, p. E3.

Celis, W. (1992, April 24). Universities reconsidering bans on hate speech. *The New York Times*, p. A11.

Court overturns Stanford University code barring bigoted speech. (1995, March 1). *The New York Times*, p. B8.

Dodge, S. (1992). Campus codes that ban hate speech are rarely used to penalize students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38*, A35.

Forney, D. (1996). Political correctness: background, perspective, and implications for student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 331-346.

Greenhouse, L. (1992, April 24). The court's 2 visions of free speech. *The New York Times*, p. A11.

Hanson, G. (1994). Free speech still an issue at America's universities. *Insight, 10* (2), 12.

Jaschik, S. (1992). Campus 'hate speech' codes in doubt after high court rejects a city ordinance. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38*, A19.

Johnsen, J. (1936). *The reference shelf: Freedom of speech.* New York: H.W. Wilson.

Jost, K. (1993). Campus speech codes. *CQ Researcher, 3*, 18

Kaplin, W. (1992). A proposed process for managing the First Amendment aspects of campus hate speech. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*, 517-538.

Laramee, W. (1991). Racism, group defamation, and freedom of speech on campus. *NASPA Journal, 29*, 55-62.

Lawrence, C. (1993). If he hollers let him go. In M. Matsuda (Ed.), *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech and the First Amendment* (pp. 56-68). San Francisco: Westview Press.

Lewis, A. (1995, November 27). Living in a cocoon. *The New York Times*, p. A15.

Lubman, S. (1993, December 22). Campus speech codes are being shot down as opponents pipe up, *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A1.

Matsuda, M. (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the First Amendment.* San Francisco: Westview Press.

O'Neil, R. (1992). A time to re-evaluate campus speech codes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38*, A40.

Rabinovitz, J. (1996, January 14). Free speech faces a test on campus. *The New York Times*, p. A27.

Smolla, R. (1993). *Free speech in an open society.* New York: Vintage Books.

Speaking of free speech... (1995, December 13). *The firing line*, PBS.

Sunstein, C. (1993). *Democracy and the problem of free speech.* New York: The Free Press.

U. of Wisconsin repeals ban on 'hate speech.' (1992, September 14). *The New York Times*, p. A10.

Walker, S. (1994). *Hate speech: The history of an American controversy.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Stephanie Sue Helmers is a first year graduate student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program. She received a B.A. in Speech-Communications from Gustavus Adolphus College in May of 1996. In addition to being an Assistant Coordinator for Residence Life at IUB, Stephanie is also a Graduate Intern at the Association of College Unions International. She plans on pursuing a career in student activities and/or residence life.

GROUPS 1996: Goals, Values, and Perceptions in Intentional Residence Life Interventions

Alan Rose, Mary F. York, and Larry D. Polley

This paper presents the findings of a study of the goals, values, and perceptions of interventions that were presented by the residence life staff during the 1996 GROUPS summer bridge program at Indiana University - Bloomington. Data collected from documents, interviews, and survey responses are analyzed using the ecosystem design model and Stern's need-press theory.

Residence halls can be educationally powerful environments that enhance educational outcomes for college students by connecting classroom learning with out-of-class experiences (Keller, 1993; Miser, 1977; Schroeder & Mable, 1994; Stimpson, 1994). A comprehensive review of the literature conducted by Pascarella, Terenzini, and Blimling (1994) reveals that residence halls have a positive impact on all dimensions of student development with the possible exception of academic performance. Furthermore, residence halls that intentionally integrate their programs with the academic mission of their institutions have a more positive influence on student development, learning, and persistence than those which allow such connections to occur serendipitously or which operate on the periphery of institutional priorities (Kuh, 1994; Schroeder & Mable, 1994; Stimpson, 1994; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1994).

Intentional programming models begin with goal setting which specifies desired outcomes in terms of student learning and development (Benjamin, 1988; Leafgren, 1981; Miller, Carpenter, McCaffrey, & Thompson, 1980; Sargeant, 1977; Smith, 1977). However, evidence of the outcomes of intentionally planned interventions is minimal in the literature. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to follow a specific set of intentional interventions from initial goal setting through the assessment of student perceptions and behaviors. This paper presents the findings of a study of the goals, values, and perceptions of interventions that were presented by the residence life staff during the 1996 GROUPS summer bridge program at Indiana University - Bloomington. First this paper reviews relevant literature and guiding environmental theories. Next, the methodologies used for the study are summarized. An overview and analysis of the data

follow. Subsequently, the findings are translated through ecosystem design and perceptual perspectives of environmental theory. Finally, implications and recommendations based on the findings are addressed.

Literature Review

Residential education and intentional programming

Hess and Winston (1995) found that students tend to seek activities that will enhance their strengths rather than those that will address their developmental needs. In addition, the Department of Residence Life at Indiana University - Bloomington, in a series of annual studies of student perceptions of the residence hall environment, consistently found that residents had neutral perceptions of residence hall programming (Bourassa, Noah, Schuh, & Wilbur, 1986). Finally, Buckner (1977) examined the residence life system at Northern Illinois University before and after a restructuring intended to encourage educationally purposeful programming efforts. He found that the restructuring resulted in an increase, both in quantity and in quality, of residence hall educational programming.

Summer bridge programs

Summer bridge programs integrate academic, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities to enhance the academic, personal, and social acclimation of first generation, low income, and minority students to the university experience (Buck, 1985). They offer services including academic advising, career planning, and tutorial assistance as well as opportunities to informally interact with faculty and administrators (York & Tross, 1994). These programs are intended to promote academic achievement and encourage student persistence. Livingston and Stewart (1987) conducted a study of minority students in a summer bridge program on a predominately white campus. They found that students ranked career planning, study skills, and leadership skills programs as the most effective services in assisting in their transition to university life.

The research indicates that summer bridge programs are highly effective in reducing the anxiety of and assisting in the social, personal and academic adjustment of first generation, low income, and minority students. Ackermann's (1991) study of the University of California—Los Angeles (UCLA) Freshman Summer Program found that students felt the

program facilitated their adjustment to university life generally, and to UCLA specifically. Moreover, 90% of all underrepresented freshman students who participated in the program continued into their second year. A survey administered to Summer Bridge Program students at California State University suggests that students who do not have the advantage of participating in summer bridge programs adjust more slowly to university life (Guthrie & Guthrie, 1988). In addition, the academic integration of summer bridge students was dramatically increased. Overall, students tended to study more, to have developed study groups, and to be more confident about their ability to succeed academically (Guthrie & Guthrie, 1988).

Campus ecology

Banning (1980) states that the campus ecology approach "focuses on the transactional relationship between the student and his or her environment" (p. 213). One way to describe these transactions is to utilize the ecosystem design process (Kaiser, 1978). This process is composed of seven steps: (a) identify the core values; (b) translate these values into goal statements; (c) translate goals into programs; (d) match the programs with the students; (e) assess student perceptions of the programs and the environment; (f) observe student behaviors; and (g) analyze the data gathered in the first six steps and provide feedback to improve future design efforts.

Stern's need-press theory

According to Strange (1991), "perceptual models acknowledge that a critical element in understanding how individuals experience an environment is their subjective interpretation of that environment" (p.161). Stern's need-press theory attempts to determine the congruence and dissonance between individual student needs and environmental presses. First, it assumes that the interaction between the individual and the environment determines behavior. Second, it assumes that what individuals believe is important may be inferred from their behavior. Stern labels this concept as needs. Third, it assumes that what is important about the environment may be inferred from the perceptions of those within it. Stern labels this concept *presses*. According to Huebner (1989), Stern argues that a "stable and complementary combination of need and press [can produce]

a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment" (p. 169) in the educational experience of students.

Setting

GROUPS is a federally funded student support services program designed to increase success, including persistence, among an identified group of first generation, low income, and disabled students on the Indiana University - Bloomington campus (Embry, 1994). GROUPS students initially participate in a summer bridge program during which they attend classes for university credit, participate in campus activities, and live in a residence hall. The GROUPS summer bridge program gives GROUPS students an opportunity to experience the university before their freshman year in order to assist in their acclimation to the campus. Participation in the program is intentionally designed to assist students with the development of a sense of the university culture and an awareness of the campus resources.

The GROUPS summer bridge program is comprised of four loosely coupled functional areas: (a) the GROUPS Student Support Services Program Office; (b) the residence life staff that supervises the residence hall environment; (c) the academic support services, such as mentoring and tutoring, that are provided by campus agencies along with the GROUPS office; and (d) the academic departments that offer courses to the GROUPS students. The residence life staff may be further categorized into (a) leadership team members (RLLT), who develop a vision for the overall summer residence life program; and (b) resident assistants (RAs), who engage in informal interaction with GROUPS students on a regular basis. During the summer bridge program, the RAs present a series of intentionally designed programs under the title *Tour de GROUPS* (*TdG*). These programs are supposed to be based upon a set of goals identified by the RLLT. The researchers focused their attention on this series of programs. In order to most clearly differentiate between the GROUPS Program and *TdG* programs, this paper will refer to the latter as *interventions*.

This study sought to answer four related questions. First, what goals does the GROUPS RLLT have for the summer bridge program and are their intentions congruent with the goals of GROUPS administrators?

Second, to what extent do the goals that guide *TdG* interventions reflect the goals of GROUPS administrators and the RLLT? Third, what interventions are presented as part of *TdG* and to what extent do these interventions reflect both *TdG* and general GROUPS goals? Finally, do GROUPS students recognize when *TdG* goals and general GROUPS goals are included in interventions, and to what extent do they attend and learn from these interventions?

Methodology

The theoretical frameworks used by the researchers guided the creation of a three part methodology for this study. In order to determine goals and values, and in order to identify interventions, the researchers collected documents from and conducted interviews with key participants in the design and implementation of the GROUPS Program and *TdG* interventions. Assessment of student perceptions and behaviors was accomplished through the design and administration of a survey instrument.

Document collection

Relevant documents were collected from the GROUPS and residence life programs. Analysis of these documents revealed goals and themes that were used to design the survey instrument. These documents also provided the researchers with an understanding of the GROUPS Program and of the framework that RAs used for developing interventions.

Interviews

Two GROUPS Program administrators, two members of the RLLT, and two RAs were invited by telephone to participate in individual interviews. Each interview was conducted by two members of the research team and lasted approximately one hour. All interviews were held in office or conference room settings in the buildings in which the participants worked. An interview schedule consisting of seven open-ended questions served as a guide during the interviews. Both research team members present at each interview created a written record of the participants' responses during the interview. Afterwards, these records were compared to check for intercollector reliability.

Survey

GROUPS students were invited to complete a survey instrument during their weekly advising session in the sixth week of the eight week program by GROUPS Program advisors. The advisor presented the student with a study information sheet prepared by the researchers. This study information sheet explained the purpose of the study and presented students with the option of completing an instrument. The instrument consisted of 21 questions, most of which specifically addressed one or all of the themes identified in the documents obtained from residence life. Due to time constraints, the researchers were unable to confirm the reliability or validity of the instruments which they used.

Although the researchers intended to invite the entire population of 162 GROUPS students to participate, only about one-third of the students were actually invited due to unanticipated advisor scheduling conflicts. In all, 53 students returned surveys, representing 32.7% of the population and 94.6% of the students to whom instruments were actually distributed.

Results

Document Analysis

The contents of the documents were analyzed in order to locate statements regarding the goals of both GROUPS administrators and the RLLT. In addition, the nature of the interventions presented under the *TdG* model, as well as a basic understanding of the model itself, were sought. All three researchers read each document and highlighted portions they deemed to be significant for the study purposes. They then compared their results and discussed differences of opinion until they came to consensus. The researchers intended to assess the accuracy of their results by comparing the goals drawn from document analysis with those provided during interviews.

GROUPS documents. The GROUPS office provided copies of (a) the packet of information sent to high school guidance counselors who recommend students for the GROUPS Program, (b) the GROUPS Student Handbook and Application Packet, and (c) the GROUPS Program Vision Statement. Analysis of these documents revealed two goals. The first and more prevalent of the two is to assist GROUPS students in making the

transition from high school to college. The second goal is to enhance students' potential for persisting through graduation. Although the documents do mention this goal, the GROUPS Student Handbook alludes to persistence enhancement far less often than it mentions assisting students with their transition. In part, this may be explained by the fact that GROUPS students' foremost concern before entering the college environment is probably about what they should expect to find once they arrive on campus.

Residence life documents. The RLLT provided (a) the *TdG* manual, (b) the *TdG Program/Activity Proposal Forms* completed by RAs, and (c) access to calendar of interventions that was displayed in the RA duty office. The *TdG Manual* (1996) specifies that the goal of residence life interventions should be to challenge and educate GROUPS students. Interventions should be intentionally planned and their content should be based on the needs of the students as assessed by RAs. The *Manual* instructs each RA to participate in the development of at least four interventions during the program. At the time of the study, a total of 32 interventions had been presented.

Analysis of the documents revealed eleven themes for residence life interventions: (a) building community, (b) learning about the Indiana University - Bloomington campus or the Bloomington area, (c) health and fitness, (d) safety and security, (e) stress reduction, (f) relationships, (g) understanding gender roles, (h) recreation, (i) increasing awareness of diversity issues, (j) enhancing creativity, and (k) preparation for fall 1996. These themes are referred to as *TdG themes*. The *TdG* themes may be summarized into two general goals. First, the residence life staff intends to provide opportunities for GROUPS students to gain the knowledge and experience that they will need to survive as college students. Second, the residence life staff desires to present information which will enhance GROUPS students' potential for persistence.

Interviews

Each interviewee was asked to identify the goals of both the GROUPS Program as a whole and the residence life component of the program. They were also asked to identify the values which they believed led to the formulation of the goals that they identified.

GROUPS administrators. According to the GROUPS administrators who participated in this study, the primary goals of the GROUPS Program are to enhance persistence among the targeted student population and to provide academic and preparatory services intended to assist students in meeting their goals. The administrators stated that the primary value underlying these goals is the recognition of the importance of education as both a practical method of improving employment opportunities and a worthwhile endeavor for its own sake. Although they were aware that residence life offers several programs each week, they had not been informed of any specific programs that had been planned.

RLLT. The members of the RLLT who participated in this study identified assisting targeted students to enter and complete college as the primary goal of the GROUPS Program. Among the values which they cited as underlying this goal were the importance of education; the need for reasonably high expectations in terms of attendance, punctuality, and academic achievement; and the need to provide services for students at a level appropriate to each individual's needs. The members of the RLLT mentioned each of the *TdG* themes and provided examples of specific interventions. Like the GROUPS administrators, the team members perceived a weak link between residence life and the GROUPS administration.

RAs. The RAs who participated in this study identified several goals of the GROUPS Program such as admitting students who might not otherwise enter college and providing them with the academic background, resources, and support they will need for success. In addition, they asserted that the GROUPS Program attempts to familiarize students with the university, increase their involvement in university life, and prepare them academically. The value that they cited as underlying GROUPS programming goals was the importance of academics and grades. Additional values mentioned by RAs included the need for the development of student initiative, effort, respect, responsibility, and time management skills. The RAs identified specific residence life programs, including one which introduces current GROUPS students to successful GROUPS alumni, as the programming through which these goals are achieved.

Survey

Awareness. Respondents were aware of all eleven *TdG* themes to varying degrees. They were most aware of interventions focusing on relationships (83.0%). The next highest awareness ratings were for health and fitness and recreational interventions (each 54.7%), interventions which introduced students to the campus or to Bloomington (52.8%), and preparation for the fall semester (49.1%). Each of the other *TdG* themes was identified by fewer than one third of the respondents. This indicates that, in general, student awareness of *TdG* themes is rather low. The respondents either do not know about interventions or they do not perceive interventions' themes.

Attendance. Respondents reported substantially lower intervention attendance than intervention awareness for most *TdG* themes. The highest reported attendance was at interventions focusing on preparation for the fall semester (43.3%) followed by interventions about relationships (41.5%) and those which introduced students to the campus or to Bloomington (34.0%). The mean number of *TdG* themes for which respondents reported having attended one or more interventions was 2.90.

Learning. Higher percentages of respondents reported that residence life interventions had enhanced their abilities in *TdG* theme areas than reported attending interventions for most *TdG* themes. In addition, the number of respondents that indicated that interventions had enhanced their learning was greater than or equal to the number that reported awareness of interventions for all but three *TdG* themes. Most respondents reported that residence life interventions had prepared them for the fall semester (57.5%), taught them about campus and about Bloomington (56.6%), and helped them to understand gender roles (52.0%).

Effectiveness. Respondents were asked to identify the three most effective *TdG* themes from among the interventions which they had attended. Each theme was identified as one of the three most effective *TdG* themes by at least one respondent. Preparation for fall semester was selected most often as the theme of the most effective intervention (9). This theme and the relationship theme were selected most often as the second most effective *TdG* theme (6 each). Recreational interventions were selected most often as third most effective (6). In addition, the researchers

combined the number of first, second, and third selections together for each *TdG* theme. Preparation for the fall semester was selected most often (18), followed by learning about the campus or Bloomington (14) and relationships (13.5).

Satisfaction. Students were neutral regarding the overall effect of residence life interventions on their summer experience. More respondents indicated that they had no opinion of whether residence life interventions had enhanced their educational experience (35.8%) or failed to respond to the item (7.5%) than reported that they disagreed (30.2%) or agreed (26.5%) that it had. In contrast, more respondents indicated that their living arrangement was conducive to academic achievement (48.1%) than not (18.9%), while only 27.3% reported no opinion and 5.7% failed to respond.

Summary. The students who completed survey instruments appear to have some recognition of all of the *TdG* themes. However, they report high levels of awareness, attendance, and learning only from interventions about expectations for the fall semester, learning about the university and the city, recreation, and relationships. These themes may be summarized as two goals: (a) to assist GROUPS students in their transition between high school and college; and (b) to enhance students' chances of persisting to graduation.

Data Analysis

The goals identified through document analyses of GROUPS and residence life documents are congruent. Furthermore, the goals identified by GROUPS administrators and the RLLT during interviews are congruent. Therefore, the goals of the GROUPS Program are congruent with the goals of the residence life program. However, whereas the GROUPS Program tended to state its goals explicitly, the RLLT indicated goals in direct terms occasionally and implied them through *TdG* themes more frequently.

RA goals are basically congruent with the goals identified by the RLLT. Similarly, RA goals are basically congruent with the goals identified by GROUPS administrators. However, although RAs indicated during their interviews that academics were of the highest priority for the summer experience of GROUPS students, the interventions they designed did not directly address academic concerns.

Student perceptions of goals are basically congruent with the goals identified from analysis of documents and interview data provided by GROUPS administrators. However, GROUPS documents and administrators tend to be relatively certain of GROUPS Program goals and less certain of *TdG* themes. In contrast, student perceptions of goals and themes tend to be weak.

As the RLLT members with whom we spoke predicted, students tended not to recognize that interventions based on *TdG* themes were presented. However, student goals appear to be congruent with the goals identified from analysis of documents and interview data provided by the RLLT. This congruence is tempered by two facts: (a) not all students recognize these goals to the same extent as other students do; and (b) some students are more cognizant of the goal regarding assisting them with the transition to college than they are aware of the goal of ensuring that they persist to graduation.

GROUPS students' goals are basically consistent with those of RAs. However, GROUPS students tended to place a greater emphasis on academics than on residence life interventions. Whereas RAs perceived academics and residence life interventions as complementary and congruent, GROUPS students found that time constraints occasionally forced them to choose one over the other. In most cases, it appears that students selected academic pursuits. This distinction actually indicates that GROUPS students are committed to the goals of the overall GROUPS Program because academic pursuits are a crucial element of both transition and persistence.

Discussion

Campus Ecology

Step one: Value identification. The values identified by GROUPS administrators and residence life staff members were the importance of (a) an education, (b) discipline, (c) responsibility, and (d) prior experience with the college environment. These were apparent in the majority of the data collected for the study.

Step two: Translate values into goal statements. The values identified in step one underlie each of the primary goals of the GROUPS program as they are stated above. Furthermore, these values undergird the *TdG* themes.

Step three: Translate goals into programs. Residence life interventions are designed to meet many of the *TdG* themes. From a broader perspective, residence life interventions tended to meet the two overarching goals of the GROUPS Program, although they were more likely to focus on transition than on persistence.

Step four: Target programs to student groups. In general, residence life interventions meet the needs of the target student population. One ongoing intervention that was especially effective in matching student needs was a quiet study lounge.

Step five: Measure students' environmental perceptions. In general students were most aware of, most likely to report having learned from, and most likely to rate as effective interventions focusing on relationships, recreation, and preparation for the fall semester. Students appear to perceive these as the most important *TdG* themes.

Step six: Observe student behaviors. Students were most likely to attend interventions that prepared them for the fall semester or discussed relationships. More importantly, students were unlikely to attend residence life interventions in general. This may be a result of students' self-reported focus on academic pursuits.

Step seven: Analyze data and provide feedback. A version of this paper was presented to RLLT members and to GROUPS Program administrators as feedback. Furthermore, the researchers devised a list of recommendations, which is presented below.

Stern's Need-Press Theory

From the data, the researchers inferred that students have four needs. The need that is most important to students is the need for academic success. The next most important need, preparing for the fall semester, receives substantially less attention when measured solely according to residence life intervention attendance. However, the students' academic focus certainly enhances their preparation efforts. The final two student needs are the need for building relationships and the need for recreation.

The environmental presses inferred from the data are: (a) the importance of being prepared for the fall semester; (b) the drive to engage in positive interpersonal relationships; and (c) the importance of play or recreation. Furthermore, one press which students identified as important in the overall GROUPS Program but lacking in residence life interventions was an emphasis on academic concerns.

The needs of students are partially met by residence life interventions. However, although residence life interventions focus on on preparing students for the fall semester, on relationships, and on recreation, the primary need of students is not adequately addressed. Students' behavior suggests that academic success is their main need. Their perceptions indicate that residence life interventions do not address their academic concerns. However, the debate over whether residence life interventions should directly respond to this need lies outside of the scope of this research. In summary, a complementary system of student needs and residence life intervention presses exists with the one possible exception of students academic needs.

Implications

This study has potential implications for the GROUPS Program, residence life programs, and other efforts at campus programming. First, GROUPS administrators and the RLLT can each learn more about what the other attempts to accomplish during the summer bridge program. Each component of the GROUPS summer program may choose to reexamine its own goals and to explore methods to foster alternative methods of collaboration. Second, RLLT members may gain a greater understanding of how the *TdG* model is implemented by RAs and how students perceive it. Recognition of strengths and weaknesses might allow the RLLT to alter *TdG* to improve the delivery, recognition, and appropriateness of interventions as necessary. Third, GROUPS administrators may increase their knowledge about the effects of the residence life component of the summer bridge program on GROUPS students. Fourth, residence life educators at Indiana University - Bloomington and elsewhere can learn about the obstacles to and students' perceptions of a residential education

curriculum. Although this sample of one student support services program is not representative, this examination of *TdG* may reveal insights that residential educators can apply to their own programs. Fifth, residence life and other programming bodies may be interested to note the extent to which students perceive the goals that guide intentional interventions. Finally, this study provides evidence of the applicability of two environmental frameworks to residence life interventions in practice. It found that the ecosystem design process can effectively illuminate the strengths and limitations of residence life interventions, and it utilized Stern's need-press theory to locate congruencies and inconsistencies between student needs and environmental presses.

Recommendations

Recommendations for practice

GROUPS administrators should consider developing a steering committee to coordinate the efforts and requirements of the GROUPS Program office, the residence life staff, and the various academic support services and departments that contribute to the summer program. They should also develop a system that follows student achievement and supports their needs through graduation. In addition they should enhance tutoring offered in the residence hall so that it addresses students' overall academic needs.

The RLLT should ensure that residence life interventions are planned before students arrive, develop a schedule of interventions, and provide copies of the schedule both to GROUPS administrators and to students. In addition, they should expand the training provided to RAs and ensure that GROUPS administrators and staff are included in the process in order to clearly delineate the educational goals and values of the GROUPS Program. RAs should provide additional opportunities for student interaction during their first week of the summer program and beyond. Finally, greater collaboration among GROUPS administrators, residence life staff and academic support agents is strongly encouraged.

Recommendations for further study

Other researchers may wish to study GROUPS students' perceptions of summer program residence life interventions after the students have returned to the university in the fall. Furthermore, they should examine the effects of residence life interventions on academic achievement and persistence longitudinally as students continue their academic careers. Finally, they should examine other intentionally designed intervention models and summer bridge programs to determine their actual effects on students.

Conclusion

TdG is an intentionally designed curriculum of residential education interventions. It is a functional element of the summer bridge program provided by GROUPS Student Support Services designed to assist first generation, low income and disabled students acclimate to the Indiana University - Bloomington environment as well as to enhance their persistence. This study has uncovered GROUPS Program, residence life, and *TdG* goals and confirmed that they are essentially congruent. Moreover, it has found that interventions presented under the *TdG* model reflect these goals. Furthermore, it has found that students are aware of these goals, although perhaps to a lower degree than would be ideal. In addition, it found that GROUPS students reported having learned from *TdG* interventions. This study has also applied the ecosystem design process and the need-press model to analyze the data through perspectives suggested by environmental theory. Despite its limitations, this study should provide GROUPS administrators and the RLLT with valuable information that will assist in the planning of future summer bridge programs.

References

Ackermann, S. P. (1991). The benefits of summer bridge programs for underrepresented and low-income transfer students. *Community Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 15*, (2), 211-224.

Banning, J. H. (1980). The campus ecology manager role. In U. Delworth & G. R. Hanson (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 209-229). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benjamin, M. (1988). *Residence life systems and student development: A critical review and reformulation* (Student Development Monograph Series Vol. 13). Ontario, Canada: Student-Environment Study Group, Guelph University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 793)

Bourassa, D., Noah, A., Schuh, J., & Wilbur, D. (1986). *An evaluation of life in the residence halls at Indiana University from an ecosystem perspective: 1985.*

Bloomington, IN: Indiana University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 425)

Buck, C. B. (1985). *Summer bridge: A residential learning experience for high risk freshmen at the University of California, San Diego*. Columbia, SC: University of Columbia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 264 462)

Buckner, D. R. (1977). Restructuring residence hall programming: Residence hall educators with a curriculum. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 18,* 389-392.

Embry, E. (Ed.). (1994). *Campus and residence hall living information for undergraduate students on the Bloomington campus: 1994-1995.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Halls of Residence, Department of Residence Life, and Office of Orientation Programs.

Guthrie, L. F., & Guthrie, G. P. (1988). *Minority retention and achievement: Evaluation of the California State University summer bridge and intensive learning experience programs.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 835)

Hess, W. D., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (1995). Developmental task achievement and students' intentions to participate in developmental activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 36,* 314-321.

Huebner, L. A. (1989). Interaction of student and campus. In U. Delworth & G. R. Hanson (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (2nd ed., pp. 165-208). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaiser, L. R. (1978). Campus ecology and campus design. In J. Banning (Ed.), *Campus ecology: A perspective for student affairs* (pp. 24-31). Portland, OR: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Keller, B. (1993). Educational programming. In G. S. Blimling (Ed.), *The experienced resident assistant* (2nd ed., pp. 165-184). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Kuh, G. D. (1994). Creating campus climates that foster learning. In C. C. Schroeder & P. Mable (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls* (pp. 109-132). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Leafgren, F. (1981). Educational programming. *New Directions for Student Services, 13,* 23-33.

Livingston, M. D., & Stewart, M. A. (1987). Minority students on a white campus: Perception is truth. *NASPA Journal, 24,* (3), 39-49.

Miller, T. K., Carpenter, D. S., McCaffrey, S. S., & Thompson, M. J. (1980). Developmental programming: An action planning model. In F. B. Newton & K. L. Ender (Eds.), *Student development practices: Strategies for making a difference* (pp. 26-51). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Miser, K. M. (1977). Specialized programs: Developing an educational environment. In J. H. Schuh (Ed.), *Programming and Activities in College and University Residence Halls* (pp. 55-60). Association of College and University Housing Officers.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1994). The impact of residential life on students. In C. C. Schroeder & P. Mable (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls* (pp. 22-52). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Sargeant, R. C. (1977). The philosophical perspective. In J. H. Schuh (Ed.), *Programming and Activities in College and University Residence Halls* (pp. 7-10). Association of College and University Housing Officers.

Schroeder, C. C., & Mable, P. (1994). Residence halls and the college experience: Past and present. In C. C. Schroeder & P. Mable (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls* (pp. 3-21). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Smith, M. M. (1977). Developing ideas for residence halls programs. In J. H. Schuh (Ed.), *Programming and Activities in College and University Residence Halls* (pp. 18-21). Association of College and University Housing Officers.

Stimpson, R. (1994). Creating a context for educational success. In C. C. Schroeder & P. Mable (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls* (pp. 53-69). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Strange, C. C. (1991). Managing college enrollments: Theory and practice. In T. Miller and R. Winston Jr. (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs* (pp. 159-198). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (1994). Living with myths: Undergraduate education in America. *Change, 25,* (6), 28-32.

Tour de GROUPS manual. (1996). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Department of Residence Life.

York, C. M., & Tross, S. A. (1994). *Evaluation of student retention programs: An essential component.* Atlanta, GA: Georgia Institute of Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 048)

Alan Rose graduated from the CSPA program in 1997. He majored in English at Haverford College, graduating in 1990. Prior to attending IU, he worked in retail management as well as computer and accounting consulting. He also pursued a career as a singer-songwriter-acoustic guitarist and released a self-produced album of original material. At IU, he has worked as a Graduate Resident Assistant in the Collins Living Learning Center and as an Assistant Coordinator in Briscoe Residence Center.

Mary F. York, a 1997 graduate from the CSPA program, obtained her BA from UC Santa Barbara, where she majored in Sociology and minored in Black Studies. For many years, Mary has focused her intellectual interests

on the educational issues of underrepresented student populations. At IU she has served as the coordinator for the Afro-American Tutorial Program and is currently providing academic advising services for students who are on academic probation. Mary plans on pursuing her Ph.D. in Higher Education, with an emphasis on community colleges.

Larry D. Polley graduated from the CSPA program in 1996. He received a BS in business from IU in 1973. After graduation, he worked with a Big Six accounting firm and was a financial controller for a number of companies. He has been with the central administration of IU for 13 years and has developed and taught basic accounting seminars for IU staff. He is currently the Director of Treasury Accounting at IU.

This article is a condensed version of a larger report on this study. For a copy of the complete report, please contact one of the following:

Alan Rose, 26 Sullivan Way, East Brunswick, NJ 08816
Mary F. York, 1600 N. Willis Dr. #160, Bloomington, IN 47404

The Role of Faculty in the Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics

Katrina Ross

This paper discusses the role of faculty in intercollegiate athletics by tracing the evolution of the faculty athletics representative (FAR). Weaknesses surrounding the FAR's current position and governance responsibilites are identified, and implications for the present and future are offered.

Institutional control of intercollegiate athletics has been the source of considerable controversy since they began in 1852 (Frey, 1988). The governance of college sports in the United States has changed hands several times over the last 100 years as students, alumni, college presidents, faculty, and athletic directors have all enjoyed periods of control (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). But since their early involvement, faculty members, especially those appointed as a representatives of athletic interests, have attempted to find their place in relation to the educational function of athletic programs (Ramer, 1980). This paper discusses the role and place of faculty athletics representatives (FARs) in intercollegiate athletics by tracing their evolution since the beginning of intercollegiate athletics, describing the weaknesses surrounding their positions and their relation to athletic departments, and providing implications for the present and future.

The Evolution of Faculty Control in Intercollegiate Athletics

One of the most surprising factors revealed in the study of college athletics is the historical absence of effective faculty governance of the athlete's educational experience (Weistart, 1987). The role of the faculty in controlling intercollegiate athletics grew from the traditional relationship between faculty and students in extracurricular activities. When student control of athletics became chaotic, it became necessary for faculty to assume control (Shea & Wieman, 1967). In the case of intercollegiate athletics, students developed sports programs without regard to academic and safety concerns, and this perceived lack of responsibility led to faculty action (Smith, 1988).

College athletics began as student pastimes that were intramural in nature. By the 1820s, however, contests were established as vehicles for determining class honor. When these class rivalries became bloody and somewhat violent, they drew the attention of administration. Still, little structured governance existed. This all changed with the introduction of intercollegiate athletics (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

In the early days of intercollegiate competition, governing bodies were student-run and initiated. Students saw to administration and governance without direction or encouragement from faculty. The faculty's attitude was one of indifference, not opposition, as they became aware of the growing popularity of sports on campus, and chose to do nothing to control its growth (Smith, 1973). Faculty members were caught between their belief that exercise was of value to student health and their fear that uncontrolled athletics would lead to educational abuses. A tension existed between students' affection for athletics and faculty concern for educational integrity (Smith, 1988).

Although students were effective managers at the start, as teams' schedules grew and the desire to win increased, the students in charge employed questionable practices that included financial mismanagement and inadequate treatment of injuries (Smith, 1973). Student governance became threatened as faculty groups began to express alarm over students' questionable practices. Five areas of abuses caught the attention of faculty: the move from amateurism to the professionalism of athletes, increasing size and management of finances, lack of sportsmanship, the emphasis of athletics over academics, and other concerns associated with athletics, such as drinking and gambling (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

A struggle over the appropriate control of intercollegiate athletics existed from 1874 until 1898 because of the inability and unwillingness of students to control their own athletic programs (Miller & Newman, 1994). During the early part of the 20th century, the administration realized that new measures needed to be put into place. Student governance was no longer practical nor adequate. In an attempt to gain control, most institutions added faculty members to their boards in control of athletics, and in time faculty members made up a majority on these boards (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Berryman and Hardy (1982) said that as early as 1882,

Harvard's president appointed a three-man committee of faculty members that dismissed the baseball coach and developed five rules regulating competition. Similar faculty committees started at other colleges during the 1880s and '90s, such as the committee at University of Wisconsin created in 1889 with the charge of putting athletics under control (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

Smith (1973) noted that among the patterns of early athletics administration, none received more notice or spread more quickly than the system of faculty control. In 1915, Foster (as cited in Smith, 1973) published an article that listed the goals of intercollegiate athletics as finding advertising, making money, and winning, and asserted that these ambitions were in sharp contrast to the goals of university faculty. The term "faculty control" implied that the university could take control and fix the apparent problems with intercollegiate athletics (Smith, 1973).

Some of the faculty committees were responsible for scheduling and finances, while others were in charge of monitoring participant eligibility (Smith, 1973). Students complained about these intrusions, but to no avail. The new groups differed from the student-run associations in several ways. The faculty groups possessed horizontal control that blanketed all sports, not just one. Their chief concerns were not rules and championships, but limiting competition and monitoring eligibility. By 1910, students had lost their authority over intercollegiate athletics, but did continue to be represented on various joint athletic boards (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). In 1929 the Carnegie Foundation determined that the most popular type of board included a balanced representation of campus constituents, including faculty, alumni and students (Smith, 1973).

College presidents were at the center of the changes in governance structures surrounding college athletics. These individuals felt the squeeze from students, alumni, and trustees to promote institutional visibility through athletics, but they could not ignore the serious issues surrounding intercollegiate athletics (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). The faculty were in no position to manage the athletic programs that students had initiated because they lacked time and knowledge. About all they did was check excesses and prohibit aspects that they considered harmful (Smith, 1988). Concerned

presidents and faculty looked for other forms of restraint (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

Berryman and Hardy (1982) noted that by the mid-1890s, the interest in faculty-run associations grew in popularity with the development of academic federations that set common standards for such issues as admissions and degree requirements. Athletic counterparts to these groups soon developed (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). The Southern Intercollegiate Athletics Conference was founded in 1894 (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). In 1895 the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives was formed. Slaughter (1989) noted that the conference developed rules and regulations concerning eligibility, recruiting, and payment of athletes. The early 1900s saw the development of many other conferences around the United States (Slaughter, 1989).

While faculty members had some early control, this power did not ensure the transformation of athletics into a partnership with the academic mission. The faculty lost an opportunity to provide effective oversight to athletics when they refused to acknowledge the educational value of athletics (Smith, 1973). Faculty indifference inhibited them from securing a position of control during the rise of intercollegiate athletics.

One case study offers insight into successful athletics governance by faculty. In the Pacific Coast Conference (PCC) the faculty athletic representative (FAR) controlled the governance of the conference from 1946 until 1959. A description of the FARs in the PCC is a group of respected faculty members who were both talented and responsible. This group of individuals was not weak and indifferent to the athletic program, but instead was committed and informed. Media put the blame for conference controversy on the FARs. When administration attempted to dilute the power of the faculty, the conference dissolved (Thelin, 1994).

Weaknesses in the Structure of Faculty Governance

Early conferences insisted on faculty control of eligibility in terms of educational standards and this event marks a significant development in the evolution of athletic governance (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). The creation of faculty committees for athletics helped to bring athletic programs under institutional control and they continue to be successful in inhibiting abuses

regarding scholastic eligibility and admissions procedures. The faculty committee as an instrument for controlling the overall governance and policy-making of athletics has not been successful (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Faculty oversight of athletic programs is no longer effective at most institutions (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989).

The position of faculty representative for athletics has existed for more than a quarter of a century at half of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions (Ramer, 1980). Since its founding in 1906, the NCAA has produced guidelines for institutions and has evolved into a vehicle for discussing problems facing intercollegiate athletics (Smith, 1988). The NCAA's guidelines regarding the FAR is an example of such activity. The NCAA (1994) defines the FAR as a member of the institution's faculty or administrative staff who is appointed by the chief executive officer to represent the institution and its faculty in its relationship with the NCAA and conferences. Since 1989, the NCAA has mandated that an institution designate an individual to serve as its FAR and that the individual may not be an administrative or coaching member of the athletic department (NCAA, 1994).

On most college campuses, the FAR assists when needed and serves as an advisor on athletic issues. The FAR also certifies athletic eligibility and serves as a delegate to the NCAA and the institution's conference (Ramer, 1980). The FAR is put in place "to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program" (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989, p. 86). The function of the FAR and faculty committees has been to serve an advisory role, usually to approve routine procedures for administration purposes (Shea & Wieman, 1967). The specific duties of the FAR are assigned by the institution, but a core set of responsibilities are understood to be: a) maintenance of a relationship with the NCAA and the conference office; b) maintenance of intrainstitutional relationships with faculty, administration, and the department of athletics; and c) demonstration of concerned for the academic and athletic performance and the well-being of student-athletes (Cooper, 1992). These individuals have not been given authority to assist in the direction of the athletic program (Shea & Wieman, 1967).

Several problematic issues surround faculty involvement in the governance of athletics. The faculty's role has evolved into one of preventing athletics from becoming too big and detracting from the academic mission. Because of this assignment, faculty tended to exhibit authority over and place distrust in anyone connected with intercollegiate athletics (Scott, 1982). For many faculty members, athletics is a secondary priority, and they must rely on others to provide information regarding athletic interests (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Colleagues on their campus may not know about the role of the FAR. For some FARs, association with the athletic department can threaten their credibility as a faculty member. At most large universities, the FAR is not assured to represent the broad faculty sentiment, and colleagues may therefore mistrust them. Others deal with the belief that the FAR is co-opted by the athletic department and cannot represent the academic point of view fairly (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989).

Lederman (1991) identified that other criticisms of the FAR deal with the perks associated with the role. Choice tickets, special parking, and transportation to away events are becoming factors that define the role in ways that are in the interest of the athletic department. Such association leads to the belief that the FAR is an appendix of the athletic department (Lederman, 1991).

The FAR is subjected to pressures from the athletic director, coaches, and president, despite the alleged autonomy of the role. Although the FAR is put into a position of governance and advising, no one is obligated to listen to the faculty member. The lack of governance and power is not an indication of a lack of concern or interest on the part of the FAR. However, traditionally the role is superficial, so the FAR may choose not to expend valuable time and energy toward the position (Thelin, 1994). Conversely, if a FAR spends too much time fulfilling athletic obligations, the individual is inhibited from fulfilling the duties of a full-time faculty member (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989).

Faculty at many universities can claim that their athletic departments have been organized to purposely operate at a distance from the normal channels of faculty governance (Weistart, 1987). The institutions where faculty representatives have had the most voice and authority (Big-Ten and

Pac-10 institutions) are ones with a tradition of strong general faculty governance (Lederman, 1991). Most universities' organizational charts bypass faculty control altogether (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989). Faculty acting as a legitimate regulatory force would result in an extremely time consuming task, which translates into a limited prospect for success (Weistart, 1987).

There has been a call for faculty control and involvement, but usually policy statements directing the FAR have been weak when put into practice. Recent major studies on the governance of intercollegiate athletics have omitted analysis of the faculty as a factor (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989). Some groups have argued that the FAR and faculty committees have been part of the problems surrounding college athletics, rather than part of a viable solution (Lederman, 1991). The chair of the Knight Foundation Commission on the Future of College Sports observed:

Of all of the people testifying before the Knight Commission, the most disappointing, the least impressive, were the faculty (athletics committee) reps. They seemed to have no idea what their role was. Their role is obviously to represent academic interest, but they seem to have been co-opted by the athletic departments. (Thelin, 1994)

Summary

The abuses and scandals surrounding athletic departments in recent years have caught the public's attention. Faculty are crucial to the cause of ethics in athletics (Boyer, 1989). Athletics and higher education share the same concern because all aspects of the university have had examples of disregard for ethical standards (Gerdy, 1992). Faculty have a particularly important role in shaping an institution's academic program and ensuring its integrity (Weistart, 1987).

The role of the FAR has changed through time, and at many institutions it has deteriorated. Faculty members are being urged to assume a larger role in athletic governance (Cooper, 1992). Although their record of governance has been weak, they must move into a position of responsibility and active leadership (Boyer, 1989). The shame of college athletics is how these intelligent yet compliant people rationalize their irresponsibility. Faculty members act as if the negative issues surrounding the athletic department

are none of their business (Ericson, 1993). Since reform is the operative word in the arena of intercollegiate athletics, the higher education community faces a unique opportunity to redefine the role of athletics. Faculty members can and should play a role in the process (Gerdy, 1992).

Faculty must accept athletics as an inevitable and potentially positive aspect of higher education (Gerdy, 1992). Then faculty can become a voice of candor and independence that adds important balance to the discussion of reform. It is doubtful that faculty alone will refocus the priorities of major athletic programs. However, it is the obligation of faculty to ensure the emphasis of academics in an institution's athletics programs (American Association of University Professors, 1990). But skeptics point out that faculty will have to show a willingness to make tough decisions and become more vocal about the need for change (Lederman, 1991). As Weistart (1987) noted, "the moving force (behind the revelation of improprieties) is much more likely to be a newspaper reporter than a concerned faculty member" (p. 12). Faculty can become the force behind enhancing not only student-athletes' academic experiences, but also the entire collegiate experience. As a part of the process, faculty should call on peers, institutional administration, and athletic departments to advocate the inclusion of educational goals into intercollegiate athletics.

References

American Association of University Professors. (1990). The role of faculty in the governance of college athletics. A Report of the Special Committee on Athletics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 316 155)

Berryman, J. W. & Hardy, S. H. (1982). A historical view of the governance issue. In J. Frey (Ed.), *The governance of intercollegiate athletics* (pp. 15-28). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1989). Foreword. In Lapchick, R. E. and Slaughter, J. B. (Eds.), *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport.* (unnumbered). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Cooper, A. W. (1992). The role of the faculty athletic representative. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 74*, pp. 39-43.

Ericson, J. (1993). Real world, pretend universities. *Educational Record, 74*, 43-48.

Frey, J. H. (1988). Institutional control of athletics: An analysis of the role played by presidents, faculty, trustees, alumni and the NCAA. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 11*(1/2), 49-59.

Gerdy, J. R. (1992). Faculty and collegiate athletics reform: Seizing the moment. *Educational Record, 73*, 44-49.

Lederman, D. (1991, November 13). Faculty athletics representatives urged to redefine their role in movement to reform college sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* pp. A41-42.

Miller, M. T. and Newman, R. E. (1994). A study of historical academic control measures in intercollegiate athletics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 374 710).

1994-95 NCAA Manual. (1994). Overland Park, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Ramer, E. M. (1980). *Athletic committees and faculty representatives.* Shawnee Mission, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Scott, H. A. (1982). New directions in intercollegiate athletics. In J. Frey (Ed.), *The governance of intercollegiate athletics.* (pp. 29-39). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.

Shea, E. J. and Wieman, E. E. (1967). *Administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Slaughter, J. B. (1989). Where was the president? Presidents' responsibility for change in intercollegiate athletics. In R.E. Lapchick and J.B. Slaughter (Eds.), *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport* (pp. 179-191). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Smith, R. A. (1988). *Sports and freedom: The rise of big-time college athletics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, R. E. (1973). *Analysis of the role behavior and role expectation of faculty athletic committees and faculty athletic representatives in National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic colleges and universities.* (Dissertation for the Florida State University College of Education).

Thelin, J. R. (1994). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thelin, J. R. and Wiseman, L. L. (1989). *The old college try: Balancing athletics and academics in higher education* (Report No. 4). Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Weistart, J. C. (1987). College sports reform: Where are the faculty? *Academe, 73*, 12-17.

Katrina Ross graduated from the HESA program in 1997, and served as an academics assistant in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics at IU. Previously, she worked for four years ar Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference (Metro Conference) in compliance and communications. She

received a B.S. in broadcast journalism from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1990.

AIDS/HIV and Higher Education

Jeffrey Spahn

HIV and AIDS are affecting college and university campuses. Because the majority of infections occur among young adults, institutions have the opportunity to significantly impact infection rates through educational programming. This article presents a brief overview of the issues involved with HIV/AIDS and higher education while offering suggestions for continued programming efforts.

Should universities and colleges participate in Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) education? For educational institutions, the simple answer is yes. However, the difficult question then becomes what type of education should be encouraged. In addition to informational resources, should colleges and universities educate and provide physical resources for AIDS/HIV education? Campuses supply their students with physical resources for health and well being, such as recreational facilities. Should they provide students with safer sex resources such as condoms, dental-dams, and lubricants with preventative agents like non-oxynol-9?

The purpose of this paper is to present student affairs professionals with an overview of issues related to HIV/AIDS education and to recommend appropriate methods for addressing these difficult issues. First, a discussion will focus on the need to support AIDS/HIV education. Second, this article will address institutional responsibility to provide safer sex resources. Third, criticism of such programs are explained as a critique of current safer sex education. Finally, recommendations for new programs are offered in order to improve programming efforts at institutions which lack effective AIDS/HIV education.

Need For AIDS/HIV Education

To date, there is still no cure for the fatal AIDS virus. Prevention is the only method available to combat future infections. HIV education is extremely important to undergraduate student populations because traditional-age students are engaging in more sexual activity than in

previous years, yet they have little understanding of the risks for contracting HIV (Brown & Franklin, 1991). In a study conducted at Indiana University-Bloomington, students reported their levels of sexual activity. Fifty percent of males and 36 percent of females reported having sexual intercourse with someone they had just met (Reinisch, 1991). Such activity increases the risk of infection.

When considering student populations, one must acknowledge the rate of infection more than the number of fatalities. Parker indicated that results of HIV testing among college students show that 3 out of every 1000 students is HIV positive (as cited in Rewis, Schaninger, Monfiston & Chambliss, 1994). Many students are contracting HIV during their undergraduate years, but are not visibly sick or dying until a varied amount of years after leaving the institution. This lag-time in the disease's ability to manifest gives the students a false sense of low risk for infection and perceived immunity to the AIDS virus (Spears, Abraham, Sheeran & Abrams, 1995). Likewise, student affairs staff can misinterpret infection rates and underestimate student needs.

Providing Safer Sex Resources

In addition to providing informational resources, student affairs professionals must decide if it is appropriate to provide such physical resources as safer sex materials. Through recent television ads, print media, and formal teaching, AIDS education programs have begun the process of informing students of their risk for contracting HIV (Yarber, 1993). Studies show that students demonstrate a high understanding of AIDS/HIV transmission. However, they show little behavioral change with regard to protection (Oswalt & Matsen, 1992). These results indicate that institutions of higher education are failing to educate completely with regards to AIDS/HIV issues. Could part of this lack in behavioral change be due to a lack of safer sex resources and information on their proper use?

While it is important to provide information about the risk and transmission of HIV, colleges and universities also need to provide physical resources to protect their students, such as condoms, dental-dams, and lubricants with non-oxynol-9. It is important to note that Oswalt and Matsen (1992) cited the unavailability of condoms as one of the main reasons why students did not use them during sexual activity. These results

suggest that colleges and universities should not only take responsibility for informing students of dangerous behaviors, but also for protecting students from the same dangerous activity.

Discussion

The supplying of safer sex resources by higher education professionals is highly controversial and often disputed because it may encourage young adults to be sexually active. Further, the practice of sex education itself has been viewed as inappropriate for academic institutions such as colleges and universities. Two major criticisms are presented by Reiss (1995). First, he states that most sex education programs fail to discuss the value systems upon which they are based. For example, a discussion on the modes of HIV transmission can be presented without discussing the values, morals, or beliefs of an institution. Successful student affairs professionals should be aware of and incorporate the mission of the institution in all programming efforts. If such consideration is not included in HIV/AIDS programming, it is rightfully considered neglectful.

Second, Reiss (1995) expresses the idea that sex educators are corrupting young people by giving them mixed messages. He believes that it is confusing to first tell students not to have sex because they may contract sexually transmitted diseases and then to provide students with safer sex materials. This could lead to misinterpretation and may encourage sexual activity. Both criticisms view sex education as inappropriate or inadequate. But, to account for those students who are sexually active and who are contracting sexually transmitted diseases, student affairs professionals must find ways to improve safer sex education programs.

Recommendations

While acknowledging these criticisms and understanding the need for protection and prevention, we must develop new AIDS/HIV programs. From a critic's point of view, these new programs need to be more sensitive to the social and cultural norms of the institution; from an AIDS/HIV educator's point of view, these programs need to be more successful with regard to increasing prevention behaviors. New programs should educate beyond informational resources and extend into physical resources and behavioral change. Also, these programs must equally endorse all options of prevention, including abstinence and safer sex

practices. They must address attitudes, values and prejudices about AIDS/HIV (Vener, Krupka & Stamatakos, 1991). Taken collectively, these programs should not only be effective, but should gain support and participation from supporters as well as critics of current sex education programs.

References

Brown, W. E., & Franklin, H. L. (1991). *Assessing AIDS awareness among students of a regional public institution.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 007)

Oswalt, R., & Matsen, K. (1992, November). *Sex, AIDS, and the use of condoms: A survey of compliance in college students.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Eastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Reinisch, O. (1991, October 5). Promiscuity rampant: Care urged. *Lewiston Morning Tribune.* p. 24.

Reiss, M. J. (1995). Book reviews. *Journal of Moral Education, 24*(2), 199-201.

Rewis, A., Schaninger, K., Monfiston, P., & Chambliss, C. (1994). *Self reporting sexual behavior in college students.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 371 289)

Spears, R., Abraham, C., Sheeran, P., & Abrams, D. (1995). Students' judgments of the risk of HIV infection as a function of sexual practice, sex target and partner, and age and sex of student. *Journal of College Student Development,36*(2), 103-111.

Vener, A. M., Krupka, L. R., & Stamatakos, L. (1991). Students attitudes regarding the use of facilities and services by AIDS carriers. *NASPA Journal,28*(3), 216-223.

Yarber, W. L. (1993). *STDs and HIV: A guide for today's young adults.* American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance: Reston, Virginia.

Jeffrey Spahn graduated from the HESA program at Indiana University-Bloomington in 1997. He received his Bachelor of Arts in psychobiology from Hamilton College in 1995. At IUB, Jeffrey spent two years as an Assistant Coordinator of Residence Life. He has worked with both the Resident Assistant and Diversity Advocate programs.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

The Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (IUSPA) invites master's students in the college student personnel administration program to submit manuscripts for publication in the Spring, 1998 edition. These manuscripts may report original research, replicate or review prior research, or discuss theoretical, organizational, and professional issues and concerns in higher education and student affairs. The following guidelines, which are consistent with those of other professional journals, are offered to assist authors in preparing manuscripts for submission.

1. Manuscripts must be prepared according to the format and guidelines of *The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), Fourth Edition.*

2. Manuscripts should be word-processed using Word Perfect version 5.2 or higher. Manuscripts must be double spaced on 8.5" x 11" paper with a 1" margin on all sides. Use a common font style, such as Courier or Times Roman. Set all text in 12 point type, and use one font size throughout. Set headings and subheadings in boldface type. All pages with the exception of the title page should be numbered. Do not justify right margins.

3. Manuscripts should be no longer than 20 double-spaced, typewritten pages, including references, tables, and articles. Exceptions should be discussed with the co-editors prior to submission.

4. An original manuscript and seven clear copies must be submitted. Authors must also submit a 3.5" MS-DOS formatted computer disk containing the manuscript in its entirety. The original and copies of the manuscript cannot be returned.

5. Language is a powerful tool. Authors are reminded to use words that cannot be read as biased, oppressive, or offensive by reasonable people. Such resources as *The Non-Sexist Word Finder: A Dictionary of Gender Free Usage* and *The Dictionary for Bias-Free Usage: A Guide to Non-Discriminatory Language* may be useful in finding

appropriate language substitutions. Avoid the use of the term "subject." Use more specific references such as "student," "client," or "participant" instead.

6. Use titles that are short and descriptive of the manuscript's content. Do not use abbreviations in titles.

7. Only citations included in the manuscript should be listed in the references. Double check all references to ensure that all sources cited in the text appear in the references and vice versa. Make sure all references are complete and correct. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of all references, quotations, tables, and figures.

8. Manuscripts will be considered by the *Journal* Review Board through a blind review system. The text of manuscripts must not contain any clues to the authors' identity.

9. Manuscripts that are under consideration by another publication or that are intended to be submitted to another publication must not be submitted under any circumstances. Material previously published, in whole or in part, cannot be submitted unless discussed with the co-editors prior to submission.

10. Authors are responsible for adhering to accepted standards for conducting research involving human subjects, which includes students.

11. Final selections will be made and announced by the *Journal* Review Board. Authors will be notified of the publication decision in a timely manner. Authors are reminded that submission of a manuscript alone does not guarantee publication and that final publication of selected manuscripts is contingent upon the authors making whatever changes are deemed appropriate by the *Journal* Review Board. All decisions of the *Journal* Review Board shall be considered final.

12. The *Journal* Review Board will also invite an alumnus of the IU CSPA program to serve as a guest author for each edition of the *Journal*. The guest author article is intended to be a reflective addition from the unique perspective of a student affairs practitioners. Individuals who may have a particular interest in serving as a guest author should contact the Editors in the fall.